

ISMAIL HAKKI BURSEVI'S

translation of and commentary on

FUSUS AL-HIKAM

by

MUHYIDDIN IBN 'ARABI



VOLUME 3

rendered into English by

BULENT RAUF

with the help of

R. BRASS and H. TOLLEMACHE

FOREWORD

ISMÄIL HAKKI, translator of the *Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam* into Turkish, is known as 'the Bursevi' from his thirty year association with the Anatolian town of Bursa, the former capital of the Ottoman Empire.

One year before his birth, his father's house in Istanbul was destroyed by fire and the family was obliged to go to relatives in Aydos, near Edirne. It was here that Ismail Hakki was born in 1653 (1063 H).

His introduction to the Way was early. He was taken at the age of three by his father to kiss the hand of Osinan Fazli of Utpazar, Shaykh of the Jelvetiyya order, who from that day used to refer to him as 'Our student since the age of three'. Following his recommendation he left Aydos for Edirne when he was eleven in order to study with Abd al-Baki Effendi. During this period he copied by hand every book that he read, and spent much of the 12,000 dirhams of silver that he had inherited from his mother on books, living on what was left.

At the age of twenty and back in Aydos he was invited to Istanbul by Osman Fazli. He accepted with alacrity, already wishing to further his education in Istanbul. He attended Osman Fazli's own lectures in various mosques, and also those of other well-known gnostics. It was during this time that he learned Persian, and that he started translating and commenting upon certain suras of the Quran and hadiths of the Prophet. Renowned for his fast and clear handwriting, he was an adept student of calligraphy. Also evidently of music, for he set to music many of the hymns of the seventeenth-century founder of the Jelvetiyya order, Aziz Mahmud Hudayi Effendi.

In 1675 he was sent to Üsküp (Skopje) where he founded a Jelvetiyya *tekke* and married the daughter of Shaykh Mustafa Ushshaki. Here he began to preach. However he was not understood, by the dogmatic imams, the ignorant people and crude Sufis of the town, and particularly the muftu, the religious authority. The young shaykh was treated very badly, and even threatened with beating and death, but he battled on patiently, fighting ignorance, for six years. At last Osman Fazli replaced him and transferred him to Köprülü. There he stayed for a little over a year, until he was invited by the people of Sturumca to their town. With his shaykh's permission he went and taught there for two and a

half years. Then in 1685 at the age of thirty-two he was appointed shaykh of the Jelvetiyya school in Bursa.

Initially his circumstances in Bursa were very difficult. He could not find a house in which to live and was obliged to sell some of his books and prayer beads to meet the necessities of living. His nine year old daughter died of the plague and he himself suffered a great illness which lasted forty days.

Nevertheless his fame grew daily, both in Bursa and further afield, and his writing of books which was to continue throughout his life started in earnest. Now he began to travel, to major Ottoman cities and towns, to Damascus and twice to Mecca. He also took part in two campaigns in Europe with the Ottoman military forces, during one of which he was wounded. On his return he would lose no time in starting to write again.

During this period his shaykh Osman Fazli was banished to the citadel of Famagusta in Cyprus because of his criticism of Ottoman foreign policy. While he was there Ismail Hakki went to visit him for a few days in order to be able to talk at length with his shaykh. He recounts in his *Kitabu-l-Silsile* that during this conversation he received divine revelations in which he was entrusted with certain mysteries.

On the death of Osman Fazli in 1691 Ismail Hakki succeeded him as head of the Jelvetiyya order.

In 1700, following a *mubashshirah* (a veridic dream of announcement) he went to Mecca. That year the governor of Damascus, Mehmet Pasha, was leading the hajj and Ismail Hakki joined him for the circumambulation. On his return journey he stayed for three years in Damascus. During this journey the caravan was attacked by bandits and many of his books were lost, he himself barely escaping with his life.

In 1717 he returned to Damascus where he wrote several books. In 1720 he returned to his country, and stayed for almost three years in Üsküdar, writing some thirty books and pamphlets. But here in Üsküdar controversy again arose between the doctors of the law and himself, and he was obliged to go to Tekirdağ for a short while.

At the end of 1722 he returned to Bursa. He was by then nearly seventy and knew that he was approaching the end of his life. From this time on he detached himself entirely from the world. He did *waqf* of all his books and instituted a library. After giving some of his belongings to his heirs, with the remainder he built a *tekke* and a

mosque named the Mohamidiya Mosque. He ended his days completely retired from the world, occupied with writing the last of his books. When these were complete he was seventy-five years old.

Ismail Hakki wrote more than one hundred works, including several books of verse and diwan. These include translations of Arabic and Persian texts and many commentaries. He wrote equally well in Arabic and Turkish, and indeed of his books sixty are in Turkish and the rest in Arabic. He was noted for his clarity of expression, avoiding the florid excesses of many of his Ottoman contemporaries.

He is perhaps best known for his commentary on the Quran entitled '*Ruh al-Bayan*'. Another well-known work is his '*Ruh al-Mathnawi*', a commentary upon the introductory part of Jelaluddin Rumi's great work. His '*Kitabu-l-Silsile*' is a treatise on the Jelvetiyya order containing biographies of all the shaykhs, including himself. It is the major source for biographical details of his life.

Ismail Hakki Bursevi S.A. died in 1725 and returned to remain in the Universe of Beauty for which he had yearned for years. His tomb is outside of the Mihrab of the Mohamidiya Mosque which he built, and his wife is just below him. On the tombstone the date of his death is given as 1137 H. The mosque is in the Tuzpazari district of Bursa, and the local people know it as the Ismail Hakki Mosque. Many of the people of Bursa when passing stop and send a Fatiha to the Effendi.

P. J. Young
Chisholme House

1988

CONTENTS

Foreword	v
Of the Wisdom of Spirituality in the Word of Jacob	505
The Wisdom of Light in the Word of Joseph	521
Of the Wisdom of Uniqueness in the Word of Hud	563
Of the Wisdom of Opening in the Word of Salih	579
Of the Wisdom of the Heart in the Word of Jethro (Shu'ayb)	595
Of the Wisdom of Strength and Forcefulness in the Word of Lot	629
Of the Wisdom of Apportioning of Fate in the Word of Ezra (Ozeyr)	649
The Wisdom of Elevation in the Word of Jesus	669

Of the Wisdom of Spirituality
(*al-ḥikmat ar-rūḥiyyah*)
in the Word of Jacob

Now let it be known thus, that the Wisdom of Spirituality can be explained by what God said that Abraham said to Jacob and his sons: 'Indeed God has purified the religion for you' (*inna Allāh iṣṭafā lakum ad-dīn*). Therefore the Shaykh starts this chapter with the word *dīn* (religion), saying that religion is two.

First the religion which is proper to God, and the religion which is proper to the people who know God, and the people who know the people who know God, and the religion of everybody who values God. Religion in the dictionary means *inqiyād*—conforming to a regulation. But it can also come to mean the religion which is the subject of that which is proper to God. In short, religion comes to mean conforming to rules, posed and explained, proper to God; which in turn brings the servant to the submission and submission to a regulation either in an open manifested way, or in a hidden way. And the kind that is manifest openly is proved by submission to those rules which God has imposed through the language of His envoy according to His book. But submission secretly is constant belief in what the prophets confirm of what God has sent of His news. Consequently, the reality of secret submission is that there will be left no other thing except this constant concern in the *nafs*, and this submission is a complete submission to this order of God, through the order of the prophets.

What is meant by religion is submission to a regulation. Consequently, religion is two. First is the religion proper to God, and this is the religion of the person to whom God the Great has explained His religion, also the religion of the person to whom God explained directly. Consequently, religion is either from the *ḥaḍarāt-ul-jam'* without an intermediary, and it is submission to this regulation, or it is submission to a regulation which is brought to him either through the intermediary of a prophet or envoy, or through the intermediary of other believers; and the other is a religion which is accepted among the common people as the religion, and this is also acceptable to many people who have

taken from the prophets and the people of wisdom and intelligence, and this is also a blessed path.

And this religion is acceptable at the level of God at the time of the presence of the prophets and it is with this religion that people prayed to God at those times and this is the regulation of God to which people submit. And with the appearance of new explanations and religion, when this prophet is returned, this religion becomes cancelled, and it has no more place at the level of God. Exactly as one prophet's new explanation supersedes the previous prophet's explanation. Now, the religion which is proper to God is that religion which God has purified and to which He gave precedence over the religion of the people. And where the religion proper to God exists, the religion of the people has neither determination nor consideration; that is, it is not valid.

The religion which is proper to God is nothing but submission and this submission is nothing but binding oneself to a regulation and the religion proper to God is nothing other than this: that the servant binds himself to the regulation explained to him by God. Consequently, religion is no other than that to which the servant binds himself, and the person who has bound himself with that which God has explained to him rests with that as religion, and also he lives in that as religion, that is to say, he builds that religion exactly as the servant lives in the prayer. Consequently, the servant builds the religion according to what God has explained and established for him. Therefore, conforming to a regulation is your action, therefore religion is your action, therefore you cannot be happy unless there is something from you as action and you are conforming to that; because if religion is nothing other than conforming, and conforming is your action, you become the builder and the agent of that religion because happiness is your quality and no quality which is resultant in you can happen or come about unless it is through your action. Therefore your happiness is your action, because whatever action you choose to take necessarily has consequence on the person of the agent, and if you therefore conform to that order, necessarily you obey that order, and therefore if you obey that order, it will necessarily obey you, and will explain your completion. Therefore that which is your action proves your happiness. Equally it did not prove the Names of God except that the acts of God proved it; but His actions are you, and these actions are subsequent things. Hence God has been called by His own effects and equally you are called happy by your effects, because for you the happiness is proved by your

conforming to your actions, just as His own actions proved the Names of God because otherwise the Names of God are frozen in the Ipseity, and are not manifest and are not provable for God except when these Names are manifest in a place of manifestation by their completion and action. Consequently, God is named by every Name which is particular to a place of manifestation consequent to a particular action in all the totality of manifestations. Hence Names are proved by effects and actions. That is to say, for God to be called by a Name, and for that Name to be proved to be a Name for God, it is necessary that there should be an action, just as Names are the initiators of the manifestation of actions. And God's works is you. Therefore His actions are subsequentialities, which comes to mean that the Names of God is you; which means that they are the *a'yân-i-thâbita* and their action is subsequent. Which comes to mean that God's actions are the *a'yân* of existence, and the *a'yân* of existence are subsequentialities. Consequently, God is named because of subsequentialities which are effects and actions. With the recognition of divineness and lordliness and the creature, God becomes manifest through the qualities of Divinity, Lordship and creation, and is called God, Lord and Creator, and equally you are called by virtue of your effects and actions, *'abd-sa'id*—the contented servant. Now happiness is conforming to the orders of abstention imposed by God and submission to things like His goodwill etc., and non-conformity is bad behaviour.

If you are conforming to the order of God you obey God, and whenever you obey God in all His orders, because of the answer necessary to your posing, God also obeys you.

Therefore God does not respond to you except if you respond to Him. This is the great happiness, but the greatest happiness is that you, Man, consequent to what we have seen, collect all the Names of God in yourself and become the place of manifestation of the face of God. Although complete conformity and submission is conducive to this happiness, because also it is conducive in the long run to the greatest happiness we have mentioned, conformity is the great happiness, but because you accept to conform and submit to all these rules and live in it and build it, equally when He gives what you ask of Him, He is conformed to you, and His Divinity and His action which is no other than you, becomes established through your existence, and becomes established with its Names. The short of it is consequently that the totality of religion belongs to God, and therefore conformity equally

belongs to God. But the totality of religion is from you, not from God, except by virtue of His being the originator, because conformity is yours, not from God, and its explanation is also yours, by the request of your inclination. But the fact that it is by its origin of God is due to the fact that all action originally belongs to God and is not from the manifestations except that the manifestations demand that, by virtue of their inclination; and it is because inclination is subsequent to this demand that it becomes attributable to them. However, whether he who is conforming to God is conforming to that thing which comes through the appointment by God of the images of totality, or whether, from the level of creation, he is conforming to that which he is appointed through the images of differentiations, those conformities are in origin from God and for God, because indeed all religion is to God; even conforming is God's own.

Now, when the priesthood, that is to say the leadership in religion, that is to say the intelligent people and the wise people, people of heavy abstention etc., brought about religions, that which they brought about was through the purity of their interior and spiritual taste, and those people started and invented that religion. That is to say, when they observed through the clarity of pure light the positions of the Lordship of the Truth through the light which arose in their interior, it was the munificence of God which created them in this way and led them in this way due to their gratitude and proposed to their *nafs* and they consequently proposed to their own *nafs* the servanthood. Equally, it is also by necessity of their pure interior that they received the holy inspiration, and each one of them found a way according to their private way or character, and they invented each a private regulation to which they conformed to perform their servanthood towards God. That is to say, these invented special regulations are resultant of what such knowledge and wisdom requires as regulations, which the envoy from God to the mass of people did not bring in accordance with what is known as the way and regulations among the common people. That is to say, the way which is known among some special people is not the same way as that brought by an envoy and known among all the people. But it came to them through direct inspiration as injection or infusion into the heart and was established there. Therefore, if the wisdom and knowledge in these wise and intelligent people who invented this are regulations according to regulations that God inspired in them and they conform to that, and since that which God proposes is to

bring about a regulation so that that which is incomplete is completed, then the wisdom and regulations which appear in these ways are according to the order and agreement of God for the completion of the incomplete *nufûs*.

It is true that God has imposed recognition and prayer to God upon all the creatures, but God has equally recognized that regulation which these people conform to as emanating from His own level, but this way is the way of the select and is not the way of the masses. Every single one of the masses is not capable of withstanding the rigours of abstention and of following these threads (*sulûk*, pl. of *silk*, thread, from *salaka*, to follow), but for the people of specialness, special order is existent from God which gives them special ability through which God has given them as a gift this special order through which they are able to follow this thread and withstand its rigours.

When God has opened the gate of *rahmah* upon these people they become aware of certain regulations which they have to be aware of, and establishes in their heart a conformity to these and an esteem of their high value, and in this esteem of these things they continue and demand God's satisfaction (*riḍwân*), which is other than the known ways established by the prophets; and this way is the way of the private face, and in this there is no intermediary. Consequently, these people who find and invent these ways do not appear as prophets and envoys who are for proclaiming to the masses, because this way is not the way for the masses, but it is beyond and in addition to that which is explicit in what the prophets and envoys proclaimed. God did not impose these upon these people but these are things which they have found to be necessary beyond that which the regulations of the religions have established, such as abstentions of too much food, sleep, and fasting and *dhikr* and other things that people of *taṣawwuf* have found to be necessary to conform to. Therefore, everybody is not obliged to follow this except those who have this special disposition, which they have requested, and for them to go on this way is necessary, and they believe that by doing this they come to the satisfaction of God (*riḍwân Allâh*). God says: 'Of those people who have come into these ways, and go according to these ways and believe in them, We have given them what they deserve from what they do and this is the light of holiness and completion of the *nafs*.' And, from among these, those who imitate them without this disposition are impostors, and they are outside of establishing the Truth in these ways because they do not act according

to these regulations which they imposed on themselves by asking from God and which God has agreed to (thereby imposing these regulations for them) because these people are not conforming to these regulations which require satisfaction, since originally those who invented those regulations invented them for God and the impostors are not acting for God. And God conforms to those who conform to Him and does not conform to the impostors. Therefore, to conform to these is to conform to God, and to those who conform to God, God conforms Himself by giving them that which makes them accepted (*râdî*). But He does not conform to those who say: 'We are of that way', still not conforming to that way. In short, to conform to these regulations is to conform to God.

The conformity of the servant to the Truth is like this: either that the servant is really invested by agreement to these rules through which he is conforming, or he is variant to that, that is to say, he conforms through being variant to that. And there is no word against the obedient servant who is in agreement with all this because this servant's agreement or conformity is obvious and plain and manifest. But the variant or opposing servant, he, by his opposition (variation), has asked of God upon his *nafs* one of the two *amrs* which are in rule. One of the *amrs* is this, to conform regularly, and the other is to conform by opposition. That is to say, although they are conforming, because they think they are not conforming enough, they go into excess. It is because of their desire to conform that they go into excess. Although both are good, the first is superior as is explained in the chapter on Ozeyr (Ezra). He demands forgiveness by excess until the order of the Names '*afûw* and *ghafûr* appear in him, or he desires to be reprimanded because of this opposition until the Name *muntaqim* (Avenger) and the order of *qâhir* (Destroyer) appears and is completed in him, and this happens because of excess in demanding one of the two orders because it is without a doubt that the order is attached to the *nafs*. But in any case God's conformity to the servant becomes true and in accordance with the acts of the servant and also because God is conforming to the *hâl* of the servant. Consequently, that which is affected by the conformity of God to the servant is the *hâl* of the servant, and the conformity of God is in any case according to the demand of the servant, either by his asking of God that which is satisfactory to God or by being in opposition and asking forgiveness. In any case, whichever way the servant is, God's conforming to him is established, and that which is effective by the

establishment of God's conforming to the servant by his demands is the state of the servant, because the order of giving by God is according to his desert. That is to say, it does not flow onto the servant except in the degree and in the manner as the servant's state requires. And God appears to him according to the demands of his state either in one way, or in the case of the opposition way, as the forgiver—*'afûw* and *ghafûr*. Consequently, the opposition of the servant induces in him the increase of *kamâl*, and if the servant requires from God taking away or retribution, then God appears to him in the qualities of revenge and destruction through the Names of Avenger and Destroyer, and his state in that case does not demand progression but rather demands destruction and vengeance. The conformity of the Truth to the servant is no other than the conformity of the Truth to the servant's requirement of his desert according to his state. Therefore God conforms to the servant according to the inclination of his *hâl*, and He either inclines in softness and gentleness or in forcefulness and rigour, and in both cases it is no other than what the servant deserves according to his *hâl* and in both cases it is conforming to the religion that he has conformed to and in both cases religion is no other than what the servant deserves, meaning God's conformity to the servant whether secret or not, God conforms to that. But the secret of all this is that certainly the servant is no other than a revelation in the mirror of the Being of *haqq*, which proves that God reveals Himself in the possibilities according to that which the possibilities give to God of themselves. Consequently, for the possibilities there is nothing but that; and for every state they are in there is a different image. In short, according to the servant's cause, revelation happens in accordance with that cause.

Now let it be known like this, that the High Truth with Its Names and Qualities manifests in the mirror of the *a'yân-i-thâbita*, and the *a'yân-i-thâbita* are manifested in the mirror of the Being of Truth. In short, both the *a'yân* and the Truth are mirrors to each other. In short, as the *haqq* is the mirror for the *a'yân*, the servant by virtue of his *'ayn-i-thâbita* is a revelation in the mirror of the Being of Truth, which is manifested because of the *'ayn* of possibilities from among the Names of beliefs (*dîn*). Therefore, the conformity of the *haqq* to His believing servant is by that which is easy and thereby manifestation of the name of religion; and this the *a'yân* had already asked of, and revealed to, God. And God's conformity to the servant, even when he is not a believing servant, is consequent to the servant's demand of God; that

is, whatever state he is in, God conforms to that. Consequently every desert meted out by God is in consequence of and caused by what the *a'yân* has asked, consequent to the revelation of the form revealed in the mirror of the Being of Truth. And consequently the *a'yân* by their state caused the Truth to be responsible to them by that which their state is in, resulting in God meting out that responsibility. And the resultant desert they receive is in accordance with the states they are in. And no desert can be meted out to the possibilities from God except that which their state requires. That is, the cause of the desert they receive is the state they are in, by which they demand and of which they gave to God. Consequently, that which results in the *a'yân* is the revelation which the *ḥaqq* gives them as revelation which is existence, according to the form of their personal state. In any case, the special form is resultant because the state of the people had caused it to happen, and the states of the *a'yân* are all different. Consequently the forms are also different by virtue of their states being different; consequently revelation is different by virtue of the difference of the *a'yân* which are recipients of that revelation. Consequently the effect on the servant is due to the effect of the state of the servant. Which means that God did not give to the servant *khayr* (good) if the servant did not demand that, and did not give the opposite if the servant did not demand that, which means that the *nafs* of the servant is both bountiful to itself and punishes itself. Therefore, when a punishment falls upon the *nafs*, let the *nafs* blame no one but itself, and equally when the niceties and goodness fall on him, let him give grace to no one for it, because for God *ḥujjat-i-bâligha* (irrefutable proof) is established that God is knowing of them because knowledge is subject to that which is known. Which means that the *ḥaqq* does not enter into transaction with them except that that which is of their form is drawn in the Divine knowledge of their fixity (*thubût*), and again knowledge is subject to that which is known. And if *khayr* or the opposite is from their own *nafs* this mystery is the mystery of *qadar* (fate), and from this mystery it has been realized that whether a revelation to a servant is easy or not it is caused by the state of the servant.

After this that other mystery which is above this first mystery: this problem as witnessed through its example is without a doubt from the possibilities of non-existence which are fixed according to their origin. That is to say, it is fixed in non-existence (*'adamiyyah*) and there is no existence other than the existence of God which is definite in the *nufûs*

of the possibilities and of the *a'yân*, which is not fixed according to the images of its state. Consequently, Truth manifested because of the states of non-existence, by dressing up in the images of the states of non-existence of the non-existent possibilities. Consequently that which manifests in the images of the states of the possibilities is the Being of the *ḥaqq*, and the possibilities of non-existence are fixed according to their origin. Therefore, if you were in knowledge of this mystery, you would definitely know in the image of the states of possibilities who is the one that is made tasteful and who is the one that is made to suffer. That is to say, in the images of the states of possibilities, which is defined by Divine revelation, the one that is good and the one which is suffering is no other than the Truth, but both suffering and well-being qualities are of immanence (*kawn*). Their applicability to the Truth must be from one of the two sides, one of which is that God qualifies Himself in His descent (into the images) of immanence such as cases of being devious or being mocking, cautious; and the other face is this, that it is the return to the Truth of immanence and the qualities of immanence. But the totality of qualities with respect to Uniqueness are all annihilated in it, and in it there is neither taking pleasure nor suffering. That is to say, you will know why and how that which has caused a state or one of any states is the revelation of the *ḥaqq*, by reason that it was necessary for the *ḥaqq* to take the form of that state. Therefore desert which is *'uqûbah* and *i'aqâb* being the *'aqîb* of the state in meaning is equally applicable to good desert and bad desert except that in common religious law that desert which is good is called (*thawâb*) good works and in cases of bad things it is called punishment (*'iqâb*). (*i'aqâb*, *'aqîb*, *'uqûbah*, are all from the same root as the word *ya'qûb* (Jacob) which means that which has received his desert.) In other words, one state (*ḥâl*) is recompensed or receives its desert by the state that follows it which is its reward, and that reward can be good or bad according to its usage in religion, but this rewarding is of the consequence of the state of the servant, which God is obliged, out of His benevolence and greatness, to give; and the servant returns time and time again to his inclination, which means that religion is habit, and habit means returning again and again to the same state. But in being there is no possibility of returning to a state which is passed and no state can ever be repeated. And if there is no repetition possible in the manifestation or revelation, consequently there cannot be a repetition in the state. The first revelation was never the same as

the following revelation but was perhaps similar to it. That is to say, it never was a repetition, therefore a habit. But by the state in which its 'ayn was, that revelation for that 'ayn-i-thâbita, because it was resembling its unknowable state, that state has been called habit or return. Just as in the *amr* itself there is desert since the first state repeats the second state, in another way in the order (*amr*) itself there is no desert because desert is a state in possibility from among the states of possibilities. And the state of possibility or rather a possibility's state in manifestation is one following the other. Therefore, as the first state has induced the second, in this manner the second is its desert; but as the second state, just as the other states of the possibility, is a state for the possibility, it is not a desert. Consequently, in one way there is a repetition and in another there is not. This matter is such a problem that the knowledgeable people of this instance have misled in this. That is to say, they have misled in the explanation of this matter, which means that they have left aside the explanation of this matter in the truthful explanation, but it is not possible that they were ignorant of it, because this problem is one of the mysteries of *qadar* which is built upon creations.

Let it be known that when the single religion was repeated in its meaning it appeared that Reality at the very beginning of *ghayb* became repeated. Therefore, revelations of religion at the level of appearance of revelation is consequent to the state of the servant's 'ayn-i-thâbita. Therefore it did not become repeated to the servant except as a result of his state, and in reality it is necessary that states cannot be repeated, because the repetitious state which causes this revelation was not, and equally could not be, repeated. What may be is that it appeared in the image of the first state and there is no other than this order, consequently there is no repetition in revelation and equally there is no repetition in the state. Consequently, states were never repetitious or limited except in the appearance of the revelation, and each appearance is similar to the previous appearance but never the same. Therefore there definitely never is repetition because there is no repetition in the state, and it is equally not in the Being which appears through the state, and there is not even repetition in the secondary appearance. But it appears with such a similarity that that similarity in the *a'yân* seems to be repeated according to a single 'ayn, but the truth of the matter is that it is not like that.

Jundi says: 'Know it like this: it is said about the doctor that he is

the servant of the nature and it is said about the envoys and their heirs that they are, among the masses, the servants of the orders of God.' But the real matter is that they are in the *amr* itself servants of the states of possibilities and their service is in accordance with their general state, which states they were fixed upon at the time when their *a'yân* were in fixity (*thubût*); which means that although people say for the doctor that he is definitely servant of the nature because the object of the doctor is to restore you to your humour, his medicine is to sustain you in your natural state, or to eliminate that which disturbs your natural state. In the same way, for the envoys and their heirs who are the doctors of the *nufûs* and who give medicines to rebalance and do away with illnesses and imbalances, it is said that they are the servants of the order of God, whether this be in accordance with the *amr* of *irâdah* (determination) or contrary to it. They are the announcers of the *amr*; they are in the *amr* itself images of *a'yân-i-mumkinât* (*a'yân* of possibilities) and they stand under these images of possibilities. Whatever the *a'yân* give they manifest that, exactly as the doctor's aim is to cure the sickness. But equally as some people are so far away from balance that the more the doctor gives them medicine, the more the illness increases, equally the aim of the envoy is to lead the people according to the decree of God and save them from the illness of having gone astray, but he who has no ability to receive guidance, as the envoy and his heirs invite them to discrimination, their deviation increases. Therefore, both the doctor's and the envoy's work is to bring the bodies and souls to health and lead them to it, but only those who have the ability to receive this direction and health become healthy and guided, and those that do not, their illness and deviation becomes more acute. And the service of these people to the *a'yân* of possibilities is from the totality of their *hâls* which state they were in when their *a'yân-i-thâbita* were in the state of fixity (*thubût*) in the Divine Knowledge. Now look at this; what a strange situation; that although in appearance they are the servants of the order of God, in the order itself they are the servants of the states of possibilities and equally their service at the state of the fixity of their *a'yân* was due to their general state. There is no exception to what has just been said; which means that the doctor is the servant of the nature and the envoys and their heirs are the servants of the *amr* of God only if the servant who is required to serve the Divine order at the level of the image of that which he serves is the servant that is there arrested either through his state or through his word; because it is not

true to say of the doctor that he is the servant of nature except in this instance, when the doctor follows the allowances of the order of the nature, because nature allows in the body of the ill a special condition because of which condition the sick is called the sick; and if the doctor was really the servant of the nature, through his service he would certainly increase this nature which is the condition of sickness. But the doctor forbids nature from the sick by demanding health; yet health is also from nature and by doing this he builds another condition which is opposed to the nature of the sick. Through this consideration the doctor is not necessarily always the servant of the nature and he is not definitely in accordance with the level of the image of the sick. Because had he been poised at the level of this image he would have been in allowance of this in every state of his states. Yet illness is also a state of this man's generality of states because nature caused in the condition of the sick a special situation by which the sick is called the sick. Now know this, that the face of the lack of veracity that the doctors necessarily are of service to the nature, and the envoys and their heirs necessarily serve the *a'yân* of possibilities, is this: if by medication the doctor has caused the illness to increase, because the state of the patient is such that the medication increases the malady, the doctor therefore does not serve the nature. Perhaps their aim was to change the condition of the sick by changing to the previous state or to the true condition of the servant, yet they have not served nature by bringing them to health. In the same way, the envoys have called the people who have no ability for guidance, which caused their anger and deviation to increase, and if this continues in this way and if the people from the place of manifestation of an envoy are deserving of malediction, they become maledicted, exactly as the *sûrat* says: 'Cursed be those who have covered up the Truth from among the children of Israel in the languages (messages) of David and Jesus, son of Mary.' Consequently, for the envoy who has been sent by the order of God, whose aim was to guide, the Divine order has not taken place. Therefore, the envoy and his heirs have not necessarily served the Divine order except in their capacity of telling everybody about it. And the doctor is not the servant of nature except by this: that the doctor does not cure the ill nor change the nature of the sick except again by nature. That is to say, by the help of nature the doctor can change the nature and he is the servant of nature only through this, but he is not necessarily always the servant of nature. So if the doctor is servant to the nature by

bringing to health, he is the servant of nature; if the patient becomes sicker, he is not. In the same way, the envoys and their heirs are servants in one way by inviting the people to the order of God, and they are not servants of the order of God by inviting people who are not receptive. Because if there is an order for a thing to happen and it did not happen, it is in accordance with the Quranic saying: '*Wa mâ 'ala ar-rasûl illa al-balâgh*' — 'There is no other obligation to the *rasûl* except to announce.' Therefore, the *rasûl* and his heirs are for the people (*nufûs*) an eventual doctor and they are in conformity with the Divine order (*amr*) if God has ordered them to bring the people to recuperation. But this means that he looks both towards curing the people and God's desire (*irâdah*). Therefore he looks to God's order which is to cure people and he sees Truth in that; and it appears that *ḥaqq* has ordered him to do something which is opposed to what God told him to do, yet nothing happens unless God orders it and the thing happens only because He has ordered it, and things happen because the order of God is pertaining to that thing that happens. But God has ordered something, and God's determination for that thing to happen was in the order in the manifest state at the level of the envoy telling them of it. But although the order took place, its appertaining determination did not take place through that appointed servant (envoy) that had to obey that order. Which shows that if the determination is not a condition of appertainment to the order, then the order happens, but that which does not appertain to the execution of the order does not happen. Therefore the envoy does conform to the order, but the resultant determination which does not belong to him does not happen, which proves that in an order what results is that which in that order is the determination appertaining to that order and only that which appertains to that order happens (and not necessarily that which is not appertaining to it in determination). That is, with the language of the envoy who is the appointed servant, that to which this appertaining determination applies happens, and not the rest. Therefore, in an envoy who by his language does pronounce the order of God, that which causes objection or deviation from it is not called disobedience on the part of the envoy, because the envoy has already done what he was told. An envoy is only to announce and nothing else.

Now that which was appointed to happen by the language of the envoy happened, and that that which was its appertaining determination did not happen is because in the Knowledge of God the non-happening

of that determination was fixed. But a determination is subject to knowledge, and knowledge in the 'ayn of the appointed person is subject to the state and inclination of the fixity in the 'ayn of that appointed person. Therefore the order happened through the speech of the envoy but that which seemed its appertaining determination did not happen. And this is on purpose so, so that the difference between those in whose 'ayn-i-thâbita that which was hidden of objection, rebellion etc., became obvious, because if these things do not become obvious, deviation and rebellion do not reach completion, and if they do not reach completion in the open it does not happen (and they remain the same as the others), and this is to manifest the people whose inclination (due to their 'ayn) is of agreement, and those whose inclination in their 'ayn is of non-agreement which is felony becomes obvious, until and so that the rules of that which is bountified and that which is in constriction also become apparent. That is why the Prophet said one day: the *sûrats* concerning Hud and his brothers, *sûrats* in which there is special attention to announcement of God's order, have 'made me old and made my hair and beard go white'. Then those words which come from the mouth of the state of envoyship are due to the fact, which is contained in the *sûrat* on Hud, that the envoy does not know whether he is appointed with that which is in conformity with the determination and whether through his appointment that thing will happen or whether it is contrary to the determination. Because while the envoy is in proclamation, in the Presence of Knowledge in the state of fixity of the *a'yân* of possibilities whether the inclination of the *a'yân* is to agree with the invitation of the prophet or whether they are veiled from agreement, the prophet does not know. Because had the prophet known he would have been worried and distressed in his announcement. And the order of invitation would have been wanting in completion. Since the appointment of the envoy is to announce to all without exception, the prophet would become distressed in seeing that only those who are under the appertaining determination listen to him and those who are not do not listen to him, not knowing the reason why and thinking he has failed. And if in invitation he thinks that he is the faulty one in his announcement and increases into excess and enlarges his announcement, he would go beyond his capacity and his scope, and he would have to restrain himself because he is not appointed to offer to them beyond his capacity and scope because his presence is *rahmah* to the universes, and because overmanifesting in what he is charged with is to work

towards the complete destruction of the people. But if he, because he is not charged with excess in his capacity, abstains from this, then he thinks he has failed in his invitations. And if this order of invitation is under these conditions it is to restrict the envoy from overdoing and prevent him from excesses, but at the same time it would have been in excess of the capacities of those who are being invited. And if he knew, the envoy would be uncertain between the two orders which one is under the determination and which one is not, and he would have been extremely distressed by those who did not comply. Therefore, as we have mentioned, when an envoy manifests with an order of invitation, he is veiled from the knowledge of the inclination of things, so that he can carry on his invitation without worry and that his invitation is universal over everybody; consequently, as we see, the order to invite for the envoy is for the envoy a Divine imposition. Now a person does not know the *ḥukm* of *irādah* except after the aim is reached. That is to say, he only knows after the aim is reached whether for the happening of that aim there was Divine determination or not, and that person only knows the order of determination if God has opened his *kashf*; that is to say, if God has unveiled his vision and caused *kashf* to happen. And God does not open the vision of *kashf* of everybody, and among those whose vision of *kashf* is opened it is not opened at all times. That is why this *kashf* is rare and it happens for individuals at special times; it does not become their property. Because it so happens at times that the *kâmil 'ârif* has his vision on the uniqueness, at which time he is veiled from plurality, and at times he is in a state of looking at the plurality and he is veiled from looking at the uniqueness, which means he is not constantly the owner of the *kashf* of the uniqueness and of the veils of plurality. That is why He caused the Prophet to say: 'Say, that I have no knowledge for what purpose I am used or to what purpose you are used.' Which means that he is not constantly at all times in *kashf*; to be able to know at every instant, to comprehend the state of fixity of the orders of possibilities and to know the determination of each *'ayn*.



The Wisdom of Light
(*al-hikmat an-nûriyyah*)
in the Word of Joseph

This is the Wisdom of Light which expands its light to the Presence of *khayâl*. (In certain copies it reads: ‘. . . to the universe of *khayâl*.’) That the light of this Wisdom of the Light expands over the Presence of *khayâl* means that the light which is the essential quality of absolute *mithâl* is extended over the Presence of *khayâl* which is the Presence of sleep. In other words, when the human subtlety, which is the human spirit, is transported and extended over the Presence of *khayâl* with all its strength from the Presence of the senses, and when the sleeper’s mind is true, veridic, in perfect health, and his character is equal and straight, and if the mirror of his heart is polished clean from considerations of passions and from considerations of reflections and aspecting and being present with Lords through all kinds of abstentions and endeavours, and if the determination of joining were to remain and were alive between the Presence of continuous *khayâl* and discontinuous *khayâl* which is the absolute *mithâl*, and if, further, the Divine Will appertained to the revealing of certain unknowable meanings in forms of images of *khayâl* to that sleeper, then the light of the Unknowable, which is the essential quality of the absolute *mithâl*, expands upon the Presence of *khayâl*. Consequently, due to this expansion, the sleeper observes in the images of the *khayâl* the unknowable meanings which come down in the Presence of *khayâl*. In this kind of dream the images made by the Presence of *khayâl* are in concordance and suitable to the images which are the images of the exterior, and in this dream there is no interpretation. In other kinds of dreams these do not concord because of the power of forming images of the sleeper, and his state and the place of the dream. This is also so due to his overriding quality in comprehension at the time. In such cases the imagined images manifest in the images either which are in opposition to the origin, or in the images which resemble and are related to the origin. In this dream interpretation is necessary because one image manifests for many different meanings to one person or to several people. With all that,

one meaning is intended for the purpose of the person who sees the image. This dream is also of two kinds. One kind is for the bringing down of small portions and another kind is for the most perfect of characters. The people of the second part of this are also in two parts. One part knows the realm of dreams, those of the other part are learners. If the person is of the ones who know, he sees the truth in the dream. Consequently, he knows its relationship to the individuation which is the individuation in the Divine Knowledge and the image which is the image which is represented in the universe of the absolute *mithâl* which is seen according to the opposite of the origin through the light of knowledge which is the greatest and the most complete, which is the knowledge of interpretation, and knowing the meaning which takes form in that image in the Presence of sleep he interprets in the universe of senses with its original, just as the Envoy (S.A.) interpreted milk with 'knowledge'. However, if he is of the ones who are learning, he verifies the dream and takes it according to its manifestation and awaits to be informed by God in this knowledge of what God the High intended, just like Abraham (S.A.). Consequently, in this kind of dream the light does not reveal the reality of the image seen by being imagined in the sleep purely by the expansion of the light upon the Presence of *khayâl* without knowledge. That is why the Shaykh (R.A.) said in the chapter on Isaac that the image revelations in the Presence of *khayâl* need another knowledge, by this to comprehend what God willed by such an image. If it were not like this, some dreams would not need interpretation and some transposing.

And this is the first of the beginnings of inspiration in the people of favour. That is to say, the extension of the light over the Presence of *khayâl*, which is the essential quality of the universe of *mithâl*, is the first of the beginning of inspirations concerning the prophets (S.A.), who are the people of favour. Thus, the Presence of *khayâl* which is the realm of dreams, in consideration of being the place of expansion of light, dream became the beginning of Divine inspiration. The Shaykh says in his *Futûhât*: 'Know that in fact dream is the beginning of inspiration and it does not happen except in the state of sleep.' Yet it is more suitable to translate this as: 'The expansion of light is over the Presence of *khayâl*, and the Presence of *khayâl* is the first of the beginnings of Divine inspiration', because of what follows as the words of 'Aishah (R.A.). 'Aishah (R.A.) says: 'The first beginnings of inspiration which came to the Envoy of God, whom God blessed and gave him peace,

is the true dream', which means that 'Aishah (R.A.) says: the first part of the parts of the Divine inspiration with which the Envoy of God, peace and blessings be upon him, was started, that is to say, with which God the Great began the inspiration to the Envoy (S.A.), was the true dream. Consequently, for the Envoy (S.A.) the true dream became the beginning of Divine inspiration. The reason why the Shaykh (R.A.) says: '. . . and this does not happen except in the state of sleep' is to show that to be started with dreams as a part from the parts of the Divine inspiration for the Envoy (S.A.) was before his being manifested with the dream. And he did not see dreams except that they all came out as clear as the early morning. At the time of the beginning of the manifestation of prophethood of the Envoy of God, peace and blessings of God upon him, his state was such that he would not see a dream except that that dream was like the manifestation of a faithful morning in the universe of witnessing, bright and clear. The Shaykh (R.A.) says: She says (that is, 'Aishah, R.A.): 'There was nothing hidden in it.' She indicates with her words: '. . . just like the early morning' to the fact that there was nothing hidden in the fact that in the veracity of his dream and in the images of his *khayâl* manifested outside, which was not the same as the images, that it was clear like the early morning. In the *Futûhât* the Shaykh (R.A.) says: "Aishah (R.A.) in the true *ḥadîth* says: the first beginning of inspiration which started the Envoy of God (S.A.) is true dream. He did not see a dream which did not come out clear as the daylight, and the reason in this for his (S.A.) believing it is that he established this in the *ḥadîth* when he said: "Believe in the dream." As he said "believe in it" he did not say it without comprehending it by any one of the parts of his senses or by all of them, and he did not say it by accident, and he would not have said it when he was awake, of a thing that he imagined in his *nafs*, if he did not see it completely, exactly, in the senses, and this is the cause of the veracity of his dream.' And it is up to here that reaches her knowledge, no further. That is to say, the knowledge of 'Aishah (R.A.) does not go any further than the happening of dreams which were true and that the beginning of the inspiration to the Envoy (S.A.) was by veridic dreams. And the duration for him in this was six months, then came the Angel. Thus 'Aishah (R.A.) discriminated between the Presence of *khayâl* and the Presence of witnessing, and relinquished the coming down of the Angel with the Divine inspiration to the Presence of witnessing, and did not join the Presence of witnessing to the Presence of *khayâl*. And she did

not know that the Envoy of God (S.A.) did say: 'Indeed people are asleep. When they die they wake up.' She did not know that God's Envoy (S.A.) had said, joining the Presence of witnessing to the Presence of *khayâl*, and the Presence of *khayâl* to the Presence of witnessing, that in fact some of the people who are apparently awake, being alive with the life of the senses, are actually asleep, and that sleep is the Presence of *khayâl*, and if they die, then they awake. Consequently, the Presence of *khayâl* which is death, he joined it to the Presence of witnessing which is the place of waking up. Thus, what is understood from the *ḥadīth* is that even the Presence of witnessing is the Presence of *khayâl*, and that the Angel who was visible to the Envoy (S.A.) with the Divine inspiration is also of the Presence of *khayâl*, which means that the Envoy (S.A.) knew that each order from the universe of the unknowable which manifests into the universe of witnessing, whether its manifestation be in the universe of the senses and *khayâl*, or whether it be in the universe of *mithâl*, the knowledge of the inspiration and infusion into the mind by Divine inspiration (*ilhâm*) is an annunciation to the Envoy from God of something, that the immanencing of something was intended. Thus the Envoy (S.A.) points out with the words: 'Indeed people are asleep . . .' that each thing that the High God does over the creation is the image of a meaning from among the unknowable meanings, and the equivalent of one reality from among the realities of knowledge. However, the creatures are asleep in unawareness and thus not able to observe the above-mentioned meanings and realities in the images of mirrors and likenesses, and are veiled and distracted in love in the veil of Nature from knowing the reality of the order. Consequently, each single human being will taste the glass of the death which is willed, becoming annihilated in the witnessing of the face which remains, through the awakening of remaining after non-being become awake, and thus become cognizant through spiritual intuition and unknowable knowledge that the witness of the meaning was coy in its image of dressing up, and that the reflection of the immanences were the places of manifestation and reflection to the Beauty of the Real Beloved.

The universe is the mirror to the Beauty of the Witness,
And I witness His face in all the atoms.

Thus the knowledge of 'Aishah (R.A.) amounted to this, that the Envoy's (S.A.) beginning of inspiration was through veridic dreams

and that after that the Angel came, but her knowledge did not encompass the fact that the Envoy, in accordance with: 'Everything disappears and after that there is only the face of God, and He is the Witness of everything', used to witness His face in manifestation in the mirrors of all things, and the Quiddity of the *ḥaqq* present in all the degrees of the high and low, and was not lost one minute from his witnessing. That is why he said and clarified the witnessing of the Munificent face of the *ḥaqq* with the words: 'My God, I ask of You indeed the taste of vision to Your Munificent face', and having been annihilated in the witnessing, requested the taste of witnessing, as the degree of the taste of witnessing is higher than witnessing, because the annihilation in the witnessing of the *ḥaqq* is the veridic death to which the annihilation referred to in the words: 'Everything is annihilated except His face' alludes, and the taste of witnessing happens in remaining after *fanâ*'. The real waking up in the words: '. . . and when they die they wake up' is nothing other than that. And everything he saw in the state of awakening (in certain copies: in the state of sleep), they are of this sort. All he saw of images and actions in the state of awakening was of the nature of the images of the *khayâl* that he saw in his sleep, because the Envoy (S.A.) joined the state of being awake to that of being asleep. Thus, all the orders and states which were visible to him and which he understood in the state of awakening are to be joined to what he saw as imaged in the Presence of sleep, and to be taken as of the same nature. This interpretation is the preferred one. And in fact (even) when the states varied, which means that even the symbols which were manifested in the state of awakening, and their state, differed upon the one who saw the images of the states which were imaged in the state of sleep, were different because of the difference of the senses and the *khayâl*, yet each one of the images of the symbols which are manifested in the senses and the *khayâl*, because they are the images and the symbols of one meaning from among the essential meanings, there is no difference between the states. And it passed, her words, six months, but rather the whole life of the S.A. in this world was of this nature, which means, according to what she, 'Aishah (R.A.), says, six months passed which was the duration of dreams and waking. Perhaps rather that in this world the whole life of the Envoy (S.A.) passed in the nature of sleep. That is to say, just as the images seen in the sleep were interpreted with the meanings intended from them, the state of awakening of his life, which 'Aishah (R.A.) says was six months,

was rather perhaps like the totality of his life in the nature of sleep. In the state of awakening of the duration of six months, perhaps rather what he sensed in all his life, was in the nature of interpreting and passing it to God, the reality of whose Names were known to him and which were revealed to him in images. For some people the interpretation of the word 'passed' is taken as meaning 'annulled', and the words 'six months' denotes 'her words', which means then that what 'Aishah (R.A.) said, that the inspiration that the Envoy (S.A.) received lasted for six months, is annulled by the fact that rather the whole of his life in this world is of the nature of dream. However, that is (what 'Aishah says of the duration) sleep within a sleep, which means that the duration that 'Aishah mentions is a sleep in a sleep. The first sleep is the Presence of *khayâl*. The second sleep is the state of awakening, which the Envoy (S.A.) interpreted as sleep in his words: 'People sleep . . .' Under this consideration the words of 'Aishah relate to the sleep, and it would mean that he received inspiration although he was asleep. That is to say, as all the life of the Envoy (S.A.) is in the nature of a sleep, then this aspect would be sleep within a sleep, and the words: 'However, that is a sleep within a sleep' possibly can mean the same thing as the words of this nature (in the quote above). And all that arrived was of this nature, which means that everything arrived in the same way (sort, manner) as the things which were seen in the sleep, which were originally in accordance with definite images and that they appeared in the sleep or in the senses or in other images. Or it may mean that everything came in the same manner as sleep within a sleep. And that is called universe of *khayâl*, which means that anything that comes of that sort is called the universe of *khayâl*, which means it comes from the universe of *khayâl*. Thus, all the things which come from God and the Lordly inspiration to the Envoy (S.A.), whether they be through veridic dream, or whether they be in the senses by the coming of the Angel, or whether they be taken from the senses, or whether it be with the Angel's descent into the heart, all of it is from the universe of *khayâl*, even the fact that the Angel was visible to him was of the universe of *khayâl*, and this is interpreted. That is, the order which in his own *nafs* is according to such an image, manifests with an image other than that. This means that because all that comes of this nature is called the universe of *khayâl*, it is interpreted. That is to say, that order which is according to a definite image in his own *nafs* manifests in an image different to it. Then one could say, the order which is in his own *nafs* in such an

image manifests in another different image and this is the thing called universe of *khayâl* and this is interpreted. The interpreter passes on from this image which he saw when he was asleep. Thus the interpreter passes on from the image the sleeper has seen in his sleep to the image of that thing upon which the order is, if he hits the mark. This means that the interpreter passes from his *khayâl* image to his particularized image, which in the order itself that order was imaged as such an image in the universe of *mithâl*, and that it become as individualized in the Divine Knowledge, just as the manifestation of knowledge in the image of milk to the Envoy, who saw knowledge manifest in his sleep in the image of milk. And he interprets by transposition from the image of the milk to the image of knowledge. As the Envoy (S.A.) transposed the image of the milk and passed it on to the image of knowledge. And he (S.A.) transposed it as he said, the meaning of this image of milk to the image of knowledge. Thus the Envoy (S.A.) transposed the image of milk. That is to say that the image of the milk that he saw in the dream means that it is the image of the knowledge. That is to say, he interpreted with knowledge. The Shaykh (R.A.) tells in the chapter on Isaac that he was given in his sleep a glass of milk that he drank until it came out of his finger-nails, and then he gave the rest to Omar, and when he was asked: 'Oh Envoy of God, how did you transpose it?', he said: 'Knowledge', and did not leave the image of the milk as he saw it, because of his knowledge of the realm of dreams and because of his knowledge of what interpretation necessitates. Milk, at the beginning of nurturing, is nourishment for the bodies of the needy infants. In the same way, useful knowledge is nourishment for the spirits of the spirits of the believers. Equally, in the education and completion of the needy bodies and needy spirits there is the relationship of milk to knowledge. This is why in the Presence of dreams the image of knowledge manifested in the image of milk, like water which is the image of life, and honey which is the image of knowledges of gnosis of tastes, and like wine which is the images of love-affairs and fallings-in-love and of desires.

After that, he, upon whom is God's blessing and peace, was, when inspiration was given to him, taken away from all usual sensations. That is to say, when the Divine Will appertained to his receiving an inspiration, he was taken away from all his usual sensations. He was covered, that is to say, he was dressed in a dress from the *mithâl*, which he calls 'which covered him.' That is to say, he was made to wear a garment or covered from the usual senses. That is to say, he was made

to wear a clothing from the universe of *mithâl*, or he was covered from the usual senses. And he became hidden and unknown (*ghayb*) or concealed from those that were present around him, and when he was released (when the state left him), that is to say, when this garment from the universe of *mithâl*, by which he was lost to the people present, was lifted away from him, or it was rent away (*kashfed*) from him and the weight of the inspiration eliminated, he was returned to the usual senses. And he did not comprehend (that is to say, the inspiration) except in the Presence of *khayâl*, only that this cannot be called 'in sleep'. Thus the Envoy (S.A.) did not comprehend the inspiration when he was absent from the universe of the senses except in the Presence of *khayâl*, only that this kind of being absent, as when the Envoy (S.A.) was absent from the universe of the senses, cannot be called a sleep, because sleep is an order of bodily temperament and is an imposition of nature, whereas for the Divine inspiration it is taken and the Divine imposition. And in the same way, if the Angel is represented to him as a man, this is also from the Presence of *khayâl*. When the Angel appeared to the Envoy (S.A.) in the form of a man bringing the Divine inspiration, this was also from the Presence of *khayâl*. In this, what is meant by the Presence of *khayâl* is the universe of *mithâl*, because the integral spirits and the unknowable meanings are given form in the absolute *mithâl* in the images of *mithâl*, and are seen coming from there, and witnessed. Thus, when the Angel came down to the Envoy (S.A.) with the Divine inspiration, represented in the image of a man, he became manifested and represented from the universe of *mithâl* which is the Presence of *khayâl*. However, to understand that it was the Angel which was formed in the form of a person from among the people which could be understood by the senses, or represented in the image of a man, would sometimes be singularized for the Envoy (S.A.), which means that no one other than him perceived it, or it also happened that the people who were present with him also perceived him, but they did not know that that person was the Angel. When the Angel appeared to the Envoy (S.A.) in the image of a man he imparted (dropped, suggested) (*ilqâ*) the words of the Lord, that is, the inspiration, to the hearing of the Prophet, but sometimes he would descend into his heart with the Divine inspiration, even that with his being he reached the light of the spirit of the Prophet and again brought (*ilqâ*) the inspiration there. However, because of its working with the inspiration which was brought to him, the body which contained the spirit would change its temperament and

its nature would vary. After the Angel had given that inspiration to him and left him, after which that state was relieved from him, there would appear perspiration on his forehead and the flush of the face became evident on the planes of his cheeks, and he would be present again as if released from a tie. Consequently, because of this it was easier for him to receive the inspiration when the Angel brought it to him represented in the image of a man, as he received this through hearing. This is known as mutual conversation (*muhâdatha*) and in this there is no change of temperament or alteration of nature, and in these kinds of instances there is an appetizing or desirable way (*mashrab*) and a satisfaction which is easily relished for the *awliyâ'* of God.

And if he is a man, yet he is really an angel who enters into the image of a man, because the Angel which is represented as a man to the Envoy (S.A.) with the Divine inspiration is not essentially a man, and he has only entered the image of a man to be able to impart to the Envoy (S.A.) the Divine inspiration. Thus, the fact that the Angel is seen represented in the form of a man by the Envoy (S.A.) is from the universe of *khayâl*, because if it were not from the universe of *khayâl* he would have appeared in his original image and would not have been represented in another image which is the image of a man. The gnostic (the Envoy, S.A.) who saw, passed and reached its real image, which is the angelic image, which image God the High named 'Angel' (*inalak*). In many copies it is given as 'and he interpreted it', meaning that the gnostic viewer interpreted the man with the Angel and thereby until it reached its original and real image, and he said: 'This is Gabriel who came to you to teach you your religion.' Thus the Envoy (S.A.), when Gabriel came to bring down the Divine inspiration, said to his companions that this is Gabriel, which is that he interpreted the man seen as Gabriel. However, he had said to them before: 'Return that man to me.' That is to say, when Gabriel (S.A.) came to enter where the Envoy (S.A.) was, some of the companions tried to prevent him from entering, and the Envoy (S.A.) said: 'Return that man to me.' That is to say, do not prevent him from entering. And he named it by 'man' because of the fact that he appeared to them in that image. Then he said: 'This is Gabriel' and took into consideration the meaning of the image in which this man is imagined, whose real image is whom God the High named as Gabriel. He was truthful in both sayings, that is to say, both in the word 'man' and in the words 'this is Gabriel'. In the sensory eye, because of the man's appearing in the eyes of the people, and considering

the image of his manifestation he was true, in calling him a man, and he was true in his saying: 'This is Gabriel', because he was without a doubt Gabriel. Now, Oh you people of the heart who have lifted away the veil of plurality of the face of oneness, and Oh favoured man who has polished the mirror of his heart clean away of the dust of *khayâl*, let it be known for you like this, that the Shaykh (R.A.), having said that the Envoy (S.A.) in all the parts of his inspiration was from the universe of the *khayâl*, in accordance with the words: 'The people are asleep . . .', having explained that all the people in the universe of senses and witnessing are asleep and that the universe of the senses is also the universe of sleep, and having verified and clarified and exposed all this, goes on to explain the state of Joseph (S.A.).

And Joseph (S.A.) said to his father: '(Oh father) I saw (in a dream) eleven stars and a sun and a moon, and saw them prostrating themselves to me.' Thus Joseph (S.A.), by his words: 'I saw them prostrating to me', used the masculine plural pronoun which shows a declension of masculine plural, which in turn shows that he knew before he told the dream to his father that what was meant by the images of the stars was his brothers, and what was meant by the sun and the moon was his father and his aunt. And he saw his brothers in the images of the stars, and saw his father and aunt in the images of the sun and moon.

Now, the wisdom in Joseph seeing his brothers as the stars and his father as the sun and his aunt as the moon is this, that the sun and the moon in relationship to the lights we see of the other stars are like parents and origins, and the stars and the moon are, with all that, the same light as the sun. In this way, Jacob (S.A.) is like the sun of light in the sphere of prophethood, and his wife like the moon, mirror to his light and the place of its manifestation, and confidant to the mysteries of prophethood, and each of his sons rising from that risen prophethood like a felicitous star and a constellation manifested from that majestic dynasty, a star of brilliant orient. And in accordance with the understanding of the quote: 'From that Holy tree', each one of them, receiving the lights of prophethood, guided the people who were bewildered in the night of being misled and in the darkness of aim, to the way of guidance. This comprehension is on the side of the *khayâl* of Joseph (S.A.). Had it been from the side of the ones seen, that is, had it been from the side of his brothers, father and aunt, the manifestation of the brothers in the images of stars and the manifestation of his father and aunt in the images of the sun and the moon would have been what

they aimed at, which means that they would have imagined in themselves that they would appear manifest as the images of the stars and in the images of the sun and the moon, and would have desired and aimed at that, but this manifestation is not what they aimed at, desired, because had it been so, there would have been little left for them but to see the same dream and comprehend it in the universe of *khayâl* and know it in the universe of witnessing, because it happens sometimes that the comprehension of that which is in the treasuries of *khayâi* happens from both the side of the seer and the one seen, but as the knowledge did not happen to them of what Joseph (S.A.) saw, the comprehension was from Joseph (S.A.) in the treasuries of *khayâl*. That is to say, when they had no knowledge of what Joseph (S.A.) witnessed and they did not know that Joseph saw them as stars who prostrated themselves to him, it is that the comprehension happened from the side of Joseph (S.A.) from his treasury of *khayâl*. In other words, the comprehension was of what he saw in his treasury of *khayâl*, not from the side of the others. And this Jacob (S.A.) knew to be like this when it was narrated to him. This means that Jacob, when he was narrated the dream, knew at once its meaning and the mystery of the prostration. However, he also knew that because he did not know of this dream before Joseph told him, that the brothers of Joseph also did not know, and he said: 'Oh my son, do not narrate your dream to your brothers. They will plot against you a veritable plot', which means that they might come to know of your superiority, and through jealousy plot your perdition. Then he absolved his sons from this treachery and joined it to Satan, and it is not (like Jacob mentioned of absolving his sons from treachery and attaching it to the Satan) other than the very treachery from Jacob to Joseph (S.A.), which means that because of the treachery manifesting from the sons of Jacob there might arise an animosity in the heart of Joseph that he, Jacob, absolved his sons from treachery and attached it to Satan, because treachery is of the suggestion (*ilqâ*) of Satan. Another aspect of this is that when Jacob said to Joseph (S.A.): 'Do not narrate your dream to your brothers and they might plot against you a veritable plot', Joseph (S.A.) came to know the animosity of his brothers, and in his heart there was suspicion against them. Thus, as it is absolutely necessary for prophethood to have peace of chest and repose of heart and purity of interior, Jacob, to purify him above the suspicion which came about in Joseph concerning his brothers, and also to educate him, as with his intelligence he had

understood the prophethood in him and wanted to embellish it, cheated Joseph by absolving his sons and joined the treachery to the Satan, so that Joseph's heart become cleansed of suspicion concerning his brothers. However, the evident aspect is this, that the aspect of Jacob absolving his sons from treachery and joining that to the Satan, being the very treachery to Joseph, was such that Joseph being put into security from their possible treachery, they, through treachery, took him from his father and put him inside the well and plotted against him, and Joseph (S.A.) became prisoner and homeless, and because of their treachery (and 'their treachery was great') was inflicted with the great treachery of women and Zulayka. And he (Jacob) said: 'It is that the Satan is an evident enemy to Man' as his animosity is manifest. Thus, these words became for Joseph evident treachery so that he should not consider his brothers as enemies and should not erase his love of them from his heart, and with the allocation of the treachery to the Satan, which is the cause of the evident animosity of the Satan to the man, that he should also be careful that this would not emanate from his brothers and be not secure of it. However,¹ what Jacob had intended was this, that the love of his brothers should be established in Joseph's heart and also that he protect him from the treachery of his brothers.

Afterwards, Joseph said after all this, at the end of the order: 'This is the transposition of my dream of the past which my Lord brought out to be true.' That is, He manifested it in the senses after it was in the images of *khayâl*. That is to say, He showed the dream in the universe of the senses after that dream had been imaged in the images of *khayâl*. That is to say, that they prostrated themselves in the images of the stars and sun and the moon was in the images of the *khayâl*, and God the High manifested this in the universe of the senses without any change and exactly as it happened. Thus, before the brothers of Joseph, his father and aunt, entered Egypt and the prostrations of greetings (*salâm*) and deference emanated from them, Joseph (S.A.) knew the reality of the dream, that is, he knew all the time that what he saw as the images of the stars, sun and moon, were his brothers and his father and his aunt. That is why he said: 'This is the transposition of my dream of the past which my Lord brought out to be true', meaning that He manifested it to the universe of the senses from the images of *khayâl*. The meaning of the fact that the images of *khayâl* are truth is this, that the senses in the manifest should be in concordance with the true intellectual images and the personal images of the *mithâl*, because the taking of the

orders of the Unknowable (*ghayb*), sometimes it happens that it is from the universe of holiness and sometimes it happens that they are from the universe of *mithâl*, and the images of the *mithâl* cannot be except if they concord with the meanings of the intellect. Thus the external images are in concordance with the images of the *mithâl*. Joseph (S.A.) had discriminated between the images of *khayâl* and the images of the senses when he said: '. . . which my Lord brought out to be true', that is, He showed it in the senses after it was in the images of *khayâl*.

And he said of it (concerning this): 'People sleep.' Thus the honoured Prophet Mohammed, the pure, upon whom God made peace and blessings, said because of this order, that is to say, because Joseph discriminated between the senses and the *khayâl*: 'People sleep.' Thus the Envoy (S.A.) discriminated the senses from the *khayâl*, perhaps rather he said in reality that the senses is exactly the same as the *khayâl* and the *khayâl* is exactly the same as the senses. And it was that the words of Joseph (S.A.): '. . . which my Lord brought out to be true' is like a man saying that he saw in his dream that he woke up from that dream that he saw, and then interpreted it, which means that he saw in his sleep that in fact he woke up in that dream that he saw, and then after that he interpreted it. That is to say, he saw that he woke up in his dream and interpreted the dream afterwards. And he did not know that in fact he is in the sleep itself and never ceased (sleeping). If he had awakened he would have said: 'I saw such and such and I saw that I woke up, and I transposed it like this.' Yet, however, if that person woke from his sleep, the dream he had in those specific images he would narrate to his friends as: 'I saw a dream and I saw that I awoke and I transposed that dream in such and such an image.' That is, when he awakes from his sleep, the dream he saw in his dream and the images he saw in his second dream, waking up in the universe of the first dream, would recount in which way he transposed the images in that dream. This is like that. That is to say, the words of Joseph (S.A.): '. . . which my Lord brought out to be true', is the same as that man who saw a dream in a dream, and waking up from his second dream and interpreting it in the first dream, in other words, considering his dream to be of the senses, he interprets it with the manifestation of images of the senses. Thus the dream of Joseph (S.A.) is in the same position as the dream of the man in the dream, and the words: '. . . which my Lord brought out to be true' in the universe of senses, is in the same position as that man who, awakening from his second dream, interprets it in his first

dream. According to the understanding of the *ḥadīth*: 'People are asleep and when they die they awake', the universe of the senses is the universe of sleep, and the people are in it in the sleep of unawareness. Thus, when the people taste the glass of *fanā'* and become awake with the real awakening of *baqā'*, their interpretation within Truth of their witnessing of God in all the images of the senses and spiritual *khayāl*, is in the same position as that man who woke up from his dream and narrates and interprets it in the manifest senses. The universe of the senses and the *khayāl* are first, and the universe of sleep and *khayāl* is second, and sleep within a sleep is the third *khayāl*. And you, look at the difference between the comprehension of Mohammed (S.A.) and the comprehension of Joseph (S.A.) in the last order, how much dissimilarity there is between the two comprehensions, when he said: 'This is the transposition of my dream of the past and which my Lord brought out to be true', meaning to the senses, and what is it that is sensed which was not sensed? The meaning of Joseph's words was in fact: my Lord brought it to the senses, that is to say, took it out of the images of *khayāl* and made it capable of being seen by the senses (sensory), whereas what is seen in the sleep is nothing other than sensory. In fact, the *khayāl* never bestows anything except that which is of the senses. If in the universe of *khayāl* the thing imagined were not sensory, its comprehension would have been impossible. Other than this there is nothing for it to bestow. In short, there is nothing other than the sensory images in the *khayāl* which manifest, because the *khayāl* is the treasury of the senses, so consequently anything that the *khayāl* bestows is sensed.

Now, as it has been pointed out, the difference between the comprehension of Joseph (S.A.) and Mohammed, whom God blessed, is this, that Joseph, being a person of discrimination, discriminated between the images of the *khayāl* and the images of the senses, whereas Mohammed, upon him blessings and *salām*, being a person of *qur'ān*, made the images of the senses into the images of the *khayāl*, and the images of the *khayāl*, equally, into the images of the senses. Or rather perhaps that he made the external sensory images into *khayāl* as he had made sleep of the life of the world. Equally, he verified with reality and quiddity (*huwiyyah*) the *ḥaqq* which is revealed in the images of the senses at the level of the waking up of the person from life, which is the sleep of non-awareness, by death of *fanā'* in God. In other words, he made it a witness by the senses with the essence of witnessing. Thus,

the Mohammedian heirs witness the *ḥaqq* by way of imagination, which reveal themselves in the sensory images of the *khayâl* in this life which is the sleep of unawareness. And when they awake from this sleep of unawareness with death of *fanâ'* in God, at the level of the manifestation of the dawn of remaining with God, with the eye of the Unity, together with the essence of the witnessing of the Uniqueness, they witness that it was God that manifested in the forms of the senses and images of immanence, and with this they interpret.

A difficult *ḥadīth* and its mystery is abstruse,
 Who is in the immanence and there is no place for any
 being except God?

Because the Being of the *ḥaqq* which is manifest in all the places of manifestation, and who conquers, annihilates, who destroys all pluralities and numeralities by His Oneness, on account of Its degrees and places of manifestation, if It were to manifest with Its Essential Oneness in each of them, all the places of manifestation of immanence and the places of revelation of the potentialities, perhaps even the Names and the Qualities and the relationship of things of the Ipseity, would have been annihilated in His All-Conquering Light, and having detached itself from the shores of discrimination, drowning in the sea of Oneness of Truth, its being would have been joined to the sea of Uniqueness. Of the Mohammedian heirs, whether they be the prophets of the past or the saints that join him, who attained to the knowledge of the interpretation of the images which they witnessed in the sleep of the senses and of witnessing at the level of waking to remaining by God after death and *fanâ'* in God, and who reach the degree of intuition of their reality, do so only those who are Mohammedian heirs, because this knowledge is special to Mohammed, upon whom is God's blessing and *salâm*, by origin and by inheritance to his heirs. Because of this the Shaykh says: Look what honours the knowledge of the heirs of Mohammed, upon whom is God's blessing and *salâm*, which means, what an extraordinary thing which honours their knowledge, and what an honourable knowledge their knowledge is, so that with that knowledge they attain to such abstruse truth. And I will enlarge the words in this Presence (of *khayâl*) with the words of the Mohammedian Joseph, of which, God willing, you shall have knowledge. Now know it like this, that different sainthoods which exist in all the prophets and saints, are the detailing of the Mohammedian sainthood, and the totality of

sainthoods is summarized in the Mohammedian sainthood. The complete heir, who is present and individuated in the particular Mohammedian sainthood which includes all sainthoods which are differentiated in all the prophets and saints, speaks with the language of all the prophets from the Mohammedian Reality. Thus, just as the images of the *khayâl* which are interpreted with different meanings because of the different states of the one who sees the images of *khayâl* which are seen in the Presence of the *khayâl* of those who are of the same way as Joseph (S.A.), so also there are Mohammedian Josephs of the Mohammedian heirs who witness the universe of the senses and witnessing in accordance with: 'People are asleep . . .' in the Presence of sleep, and interpret the different states of the things of the Ipseity and different qualities, knowing them to be Lordly revelations and the Divine knowledges such as the images which are seen in the images of the universe of sleep as the states of the *ḥaqq*. Thus the Snaykh (R.A.) begins to explain and enlarge with detail the words which are summarized in the Presence of the *khayâ!* in the words of the Mohammedian Joseph. And we say, know that the one who is spoken of as 'other than the *ḥaqq*' or called the universe is He, which is in relationship to God like the shadow to the person, and that is the shadow of God. That is to say that that which is known in general as 'other than the *ḥaqq*' is the shadow of God, but in the special knowledge there is no existence for other than God, and if the meaning of 'other' were considered through an intellectual consideration, then it is a quality and a particularization, which are the realities of the Names at the level of the relationship of the Names to the Ipseity. Thus, this is called the images of the Names of God, because there is nothing other than the *ḥaqq* in being, and in the *ḥaqq*, in consideration of meanings of Qualities, nothing other than His Names. However, when the attributive being is considered, which is numerous through the particularizations of the potentialities, which in turn are the images of the knowledges of the *ḥaqq*, then it is called 'other than the *ḥaqq*' and also 'the universe', and the relationship of the 'other than the *ḥaqq*' to the Absolute Being is like the relationship of the shadow to the person. That is to say, just as the shadow is in-existent in itself but existent with the being of the person, in the same way, other than the *ḥaqq* and that which is called the universe is in-existent in itself and exists only by the existence of the *ḥaqq*. Thus, the attributive being which is conditioned by the conditions of the particularizations is what is understood as the shadow of God.

And consequently it is that the relationship of other than God and those which are called the universe, to God, is like the relationship of the shadow to the person, and that that which is called the universe is the shadow of God. And this is the same as the relationship of being to the universe. And this is the same as relating existence to the universe and qualifying it. That is to say, it is like saying the universe exists, because the shadow exists without a doubt in the senses. So without a doubt the shadow exists in the senses, yet the existence of the shadow is through the existence of the person. Therefore in the same way, the universe, which is the shadow of the *ḥaqq*, exists with the existence of the *ḥaqq*. Thus, the universe existing with the existence of the *ḥaqq*, and existence being attributed to it, it is called other than the *ḥaqq*. Nevertheless, the Reality, which is the same as the Being of the *ḥaqq*, is one. Consequently existence, by virtue of Reality, is one and the same potentiality. It is only other than the *ḥaqq* by virtue of its relationship to the universe. According to this consideration the word 'shadow' becomes an assignment of a supposititious reason for something connected with a quality of the person to the phrase: 'And it is the same as the relationship of being to the universe.' The gnostic Shaykh, Mu'ayyad al-Jundi, says: 'This is an assignment of a supposititious reason for something connected with a quality of the person to his words: "That which is called the universe is that which in relationship to the *ḥaqq* is like the shadow to the person".' However, in the same way, the shadow exists in the senses only when the person exists. In the same way, the universe or what is called 'other than the *ḥaqq*' is because the *ḥaqq* exists, and that is taking away any consideration from there being in existence other than God in His potentiality from all eternity, and His Being is from Its own Ipseity, just as there is no existence of the shadow without the being of the person.

However, if there is further (that is, in the senses) that this shadow will show itself therein, which means that without a doubt in the senses the shadow exists, but that shadow only manifests itself if there is a place for it existent in the senses. In other words, the shadow shows itself in the senses only if there is a place existent in the senses for it to show itself in. Rather, as it is necessary for a place to exist in the senses for the being of the shadow, in the same way, where it concerns the shadow it seems absolutely necessary that the shadow is attached in the same way to that Elevated Person, and equally, it is absolutely necessary that there be light so that the shadow can be differentiated from it. Thus,

the Being of the Absolute *ḥaqq* corresponds to the Person, and that place in which the shadow manifests corresponds to the potentialities of the possibilities, and Light is the manifestation Name of the *ḥaqq*. Now, that which is called the universe became from the particularizations and manifestation of the Being of the Absolute *ḥaqq* in the potentialities of possibilities, and equally, because of Light, which is the manifestation Name of God, and its revelation in the manifested senses, that which exists became the shadow of God. Even if you proposed the non-existence of the place wherein that shadow manifests, still the shadow would exist intellectually even though it would not exist in the senses, which means that in the light of the sun the shadow would be lit like air and would not be visible. It would perhaps rather be in effect in the person to whom that shadow would belong, that is to say, it would not be manifested. Thus, if the possibilities of the potentialities, which are the place of manifestation of the Divine shadow which is the thing called 'universe', were considered non-existent, then the shadow of the universe would not be sensed. It would rather be existent in effect in the Ipseity, just as the tree is intellectually existent in the seed. In the same way, if the shadow of the universe were not connected with the Being of the Absolute *ḥaqq*, it would not have existed. Rather, it would have remained in the non-existence ('*adam*') which is the origin of the possibilities, if one disregarded the being. But the place of manifestation of this Divine shadow called the universe, which relates it to being, is indeed the essences of the possibilities upon which this shadow has been prolonged, and this shadow is comprehended by virtue of what has been prolonged over it from the Being of this Ipseity. Thus, by virtue of that place it is understood from this Divine shadow that this Divine shadow is extended from the Absolute Being. In reality, being cannot be understood by virtue of absolute transcendence and non-particularization (*ia ta'ayyun*). Consequently, it is from this Divine shadow that it is understood by virtue of the thing which extends over this place from this Ipseity.

But the understanding happens through the Name Light (*nūr*). This means that the understanding of the Divine shadow, which is called the universe, happens through the Name Light (*nūr*) of God. Consequently, it is only as much as is understood from the Divine shadow, which is called the universe, that that much is understood of the Absolute Being of the *ḥaqq* by virtue of Its manifestation. This is so because the Reality of the Absolute Being cannot be understood except by virtue of Its particularization through the potentialities of the potentialities of the

possibilities. However, understanding happens by the Name Light of God. This means that if one disregarded the outward attribution of being which is conditional through the condition of being attributable to a place, and if one did not take into consideration the particularities of the realities of possibilities, one cannot understand the Reality of being, because being is the same as the Absolute *ḥaqq*.

And this shadow extended over the potentialities of possibilities in the image of the unknown Unknowable. This Divine shadow, which is the attributable being, extended over the potentialities of possibilities in the form of an unknown Unknowable. That is to say, the potentialities of possibilities which are distanced from the light of being, if their establishment and their being known in the Essential Knowledge and in their own being were considered without the Being of the *ḥaqq*, they would be inexistent and unknown in the darkness of the Unknowable. When the being of the light affects the potentialities in their darkness of non-existence, then luminosity of being inclines to darkness. Consequently, the extension of the attributable being upon the potentialities of possibilities extended over the darkness of non-existence which is the unknown Unknowable and became manifest. **Do you not see the shadows inclining to darkness, pointing to what there is in there of hidden?** With these words the Shaykh points to the extent of the relationship between the light of being and the potentialities of the possibilities, meaning: do you not see the shadows incline towards darkness, which are manifested at the level of the extension of the light of the sun over the images of the persons of the universe in this manifest world of senses, and which shadows point at the things hidden in their essences? **Of the extent of relationship between it and the people of which they are the shadows?** Thus, as the potentialities of possibilities are distanced from the light of being, when the light of being extends over the potentialities of possibilities, the darkness of non-existence of the potentialities affecting the luminosity of being, luminosity of being tends to incline towards shadow and manifests in that way, because when the shadow of luminosity from the absolute Light extends over the persons of the potentialities of the Unknowable, equally the darkness of the potentialities, which are inclined to darkness through condition and particularization, extends over the light of being from the potentialities of the Unknown, and then the two shadows become mixed one with the other. Thus the darkness of the unknowableness of the potentialities becoming manifest in the attributive being, the light of being becomes interior

(*bâtin*) and the light of the absolute shadow manifests darkly and conditionally. Consequently, those who are veiled with shadowy particularizations did not witness anything other than the universe. In the last resort, at the level of their superiors, God remains intelligible and conjectural, and He is not present and witnessed in their vision and witnessing. But the people of God who burn away the veil of darkness and are liberated from the veil of particularizations witness the *haqq* and become veiled by light from darkness and by the Ipseity from the shadow, and witness the Being of the *haqq*, which is One and Unique, in the things of the unknowable and the forms of the immanence. Thus, what their vision attaches itself to is the Light of the *haqq* in the darkness of the unknowableness of the immanence. However, the people of God who are superior to these are not veiled, neither by one nor the other. They witness the Light of God in the darkness of immanence, and with the uniqueness of the '*ayn*' of the potential they witness the darkness of the immanence in the Light of the Being of the *haqq*.

And even if the person is white, still his shadow is equally in this manner, which means that even if the owner of the shadow is white, still his shadow inclines to darkness. Do you not see the mountains, if they are distanced from the eye of the onlooker they appear dark, or that they are in his eyes that which the senses do not understand of colour, and that there is not anything further after this of affliction except distance? And equally the blueness of the sky, and this is nothing other than what distance resulted in in the senses in the non-luminous bodies. Now, the being which is manifested in the universe although light in reality, yet the being which is its places of manifestation is unlit by virtue of the potentialities of the possibilities. In the same way, the potentialities of possibilities are not luminous because they are inexistent even though they are qualified by establishment, but they are not qualified by being. In fact, being is light. Furthermore, even the luminous bodies in the manifest are bestowed with a sense of smallness by distance. It does not bestow darkness like in the non-luminous bodies, because distance requires colour in the non-luminous bodies, and in the luminous bodies it requires quantity. This is a further effect of distance, and the senses do not understand it in their most quantity except as small in bulk, whereas they are in their potentialities bigger than this quantity. Here, by the word 'potentiality', is meant 'in the exterior being'. It is known by the example that the sun is in body 160 and one-fourth and one-eighth times that of the earth, and to the eye it is the same quantity in body as a shield, for example, and this is equally

the effect of distance. These examples and explanations of the Shaykh is to make known that God is known to us by our knowledge of the being of the universe, just like when we know the shadow of a person, we know of the person, because as the being of the universe is conditioned by an extent over the established potentialities which are in the distance of non-existence, they happen at the other limit of distance from the Being of the Absolute because of the relative or the conditional being at the extreme distance from the Absolute. Consequently, the being of the relative or the conditional is both small and dark in vision. And it is not known from the universe except as much as is known from the shadows, meaning that one knows of the *ḥaqq* from the being of the universe only as much as can be known of things from their shadow, or only as much as can be known of the reality of the universe and the potentialities of the unknowableness of the universe, which is the realities of the quiddities. That is, only as much as is manifested in the light of being which is of the particularities manifested with being of the bodies of the *a'yân* and the images of its forms and its effects, because these are the shadows of the potentialities. They are not the potentialities of the realities which are established in the universe of *ghayb*. Consequently, as the reality behind the shadow cannot be known to us by the being of the shadow, in the same way, we cannot know the Reality of the Ipseity behind the shadow from the being of the shadow. One is in ignorance of the *ḥaqq* to the degree that one is in ignorance of the person who has that shadow, and where it concerns the universe which is the shadow of the *ḥaqq*, one is as ignorant of the *ḥaqq* as one is ignorant of that person from whom extends the shadow. And due to the fact that it is the shadow of Him, He is known. Because this sentence is written in the objective case it would mean: due to the fact that the universe is shadow for the *ḥaqq*, it is known that the *ḥaqq* is the general Lord and Divinity of the universe, and as it is not known that which is in the ipseity of that shadow of the image of that person from which it extends, in the same way, it is unknown from the *ḥaqq*. That is to say, the image of the absolute transcendence of the Ipseity of the *ḥaqq* and His non-particularization from which the light of being extended, that being which extends over the possibilities is neither understood nor witnessed, because the extension is conditional to the thing which is the place and place of manifestation of that extension. Because of this we say that the *ḥaqq* is known to us from one aspect and unknown to us from another aspect. That is, He is in fact known to us summarily because the universe,

which is His shadow, manifests in the conditionals or relativity, and on the other hand, from the aspect of His revealing Himself infinitely with absoluteness, because if the absolute image of God were known, God forbid, it would have been particularized and immured, and would have become relative and not absolute, whereas His absolute image is high beyond this with great height and grandeur. Then the Shaykh proves that the Divine shadow, which is the universes, extends over the potentiality of possibilities, with the Quranic saying: 'Do you not see how your Lord extends the shadow, and if He wanted He could have made it still?', which means that addressing Mohammed, God says: 'Do you not look at your Lord, Oh Mohammed, how He extends the light of being over the possibilities of the potentials?', in other words, how He reveals Himself in the images of the universe and in the potentialities of the universe through the Light of His Being. Further, if He wished so, that extended shadow would be still, that is to say, it would exist there in effect. In other words, that extended shadow would be in effect in the Being of the *ḥaqq* and would not be manifested. On this matter the Shaykh says: which is to say, God would not have revealed Himself to the possibilities so as to manifest the shadow, and it would have been like the rest of the possibilities which have as yet not been manifested and whose potentiality is not in being. Consequently, the Divine shadow, which is the attributive being, would have been like the things which remain among the potentialities of the possibilities which are potentially unmanifested in being. That is to say, the qualified being of the relative possibilities would have been concealed in the Being of the Absolute *ḥaqq*, just like the shadow which would be still and hidden in the essence of the person and which is not extended and in motion in being, because this is all an order of the *ghayb* and *shahâdah*. *Ghayb* is for always in the Unknowable. That which is not manifest in the universe of witnessing is still. That which is manifest in the witnessing is in movement, but is still in its reality.

'Afterwards (that is, after the extension of the shadow) We brought the sun as proof for it', and its Name is Light, of which we have already spoken. That is to say, after the extension of the shadow We brought the sun as proof for the shadow, and the sun, which is the proof, is the Light Name of the *ḥaqq* which we mentioned in our words: 'But the understanding happens through His Name Light.' That is to say, the understanding of the universe, which is the shadow of the *ḥaqq*, happens through the Light Name of the *ḥaqq*, just as the understanding of the

shadow happens by the sun, and the senses are witness to it, as in fact the shadows do not have a potentiality in themselves without the light. That is to say, it is the senses that witness that it is the sun which makes us understand the existence of the shadows, because in fact the shadows have no existence if the light of the sun did not extend. For instance, if a person were present in a very dark night, his shadow will not be manifested. Thus, in the same way, the existence and the comprehension of the shadow of the universe does not happen except through the Name Light of the *ḥaqq*. 'Then We grasped it to Ourselves with an easy grasping.' After that We grasped that extended shadow with an easy receiving back to Ourselves, by receiving back the light which was the proof of the shadow, because the ultimate cause for the manifestation of the shadow is light. Consequently, when the light is grasped back and returned to its origin, the shadow also is received back. Consequently, when the Divine Light and the revelation of the *rahmân*, which brings into being and manifests the shadow universe, is returned to its origin and is there constricted, then the shadow universe is also received back, and the *ḥaqq* receives this back with an easy receiving, and the potential possibility, which is the place for the manifestation of the shadow, remains invisible in the Unknowable (*ghayb*). The High God qualified the receiving back with 'ease', because the extension of the Divine shadow which is called the universe depends on three orders. One of these is the place of manifestation, which is the potentialities of the possibilities. Another is the manifestation and the particularization of the Being of the Absolute *ḥaqq*, and the third one is the revelation of Light which is manifest Name of the *ḥaqq*. Thus, these three are appointed as the reason and cause for the existence of the shadow of the universe. Consequently, if ever the non-existence of one of these three were considered, the shadow of the universe would not have been manifest, but the receiving back of the shadow does not depend on any condition. It is only an order concerning the way of the Will of God. Except if one considered the receiving back of the shadow by receiving back the light which proves the shadow, even then the receiving back would depend on the light. Consequently, the receiving back of the shadow is easy in relation to actual seizing and receiving back, but it is not in relationship to the Person of God as nothing is in consideration of Him. As for His seizing it back, it is because it is His shadow and manifested from Him, and the orders return to Him, all of them. The reason why God took the shadow back to Him is because in fact the

shadow is God's shadow and manifested from Him through His Essential movement of expansion and returns to Him through the movement of retraction, and the totality of the order returns to Him. And it is (that is, the being of the universe) Him (that is, the Being of the *ḥaqq*) and no other. Thus, the being of the universe is the Being of the *ḥaqq* and it is no other, because that which comes out of the source of Light is Light eternally, and the Absolute is equally the source of the relative always, and there is no one relative in which there is no Absolute. Perhaps even that the relative does not exist except with the Absolute, and the Absolute does not reveal Itself except by not being immured by the relative and by being rich beyond it, and it is Him, that is to say, the relative is the Absolute and no other. And all that we understand. This is expressed in a way where although it is: 'All that we understand', it is equally addressed to mean: all that you understand from the things of the being of the universe, it is the Being of God in the potentialities of the possibilities. Then, the thing that is understood is the Being of the *ḥaqq* which is revealed in the potentialities of the possibilities. That is to say, the thing that is understood is the Being of the *ḥaqq*, which having revealed Itself in the mirrors of the potentialities of the possibilities, is manifested with the particularities and effects and the praises and the qualities of the potentialities. And as it is due to the Quiddity of the *ḥaqq*, it is His Being. That is to say, by virtue of the fact that the Quiddity of the *ḥaqq* is manifested in that thing understood, that thing is the Being of the *ḥaqq*. And as from the point of view of the differences of the images therein, that is the potentialities of the possibilities. That is, by virtue of the differences of the images in the thing understood, that thing understood is the potentiality of the possibilities. In other words, for the unique and collective shadow which is called the universe there are two aspects. One aspect is the transcendence and absoluteness, and that is the Quiddity from the point of view of He. Consequently, the universe is the Being of the *ḥaqq*, in other words, is the same as the *ḥaqq*. And the other aspect is relativity, which is by virtue of the differences of images. Thus, the universe is the shadow of the potentialities of the individuals which are established in the Essential Knowledge, and the particularities of the potentialities which became manifested in it. Just as the name 'shadow' does not get lost from it by the differences of the images, in the same way, the name 'universe' or the name 'other than the *ḥaqq*' does not get lost from it by the differences of the images. That is to say, the name 'shadow' does not get removed or lost from the

thing understood because of the differences of the images of the potentialities of possibilities. In the same way, the name 'universe' or the name 'other than God' does not get eliminated or lost from it by the fact of the differences of the images of the individuals of the universe. From the point of view of the uniqueness of its being the shadow, it is the *ḥaqq*. That is, by virtue of the fact of the uniqueness of that thing which is understood being a shadow, that thing understood is the *ḥaqq*. Between the Uniqueness of the *ḥaqq* and the uniqueness of generality there is a difference in the order itself, because the Uniqueness of the *ḥaqq* is the Uniqueness of the Ipseity, which is transcendent from the particularizations of plurality, and the *ḥaqq* can never be particularized either by particularization of plurality or non-particularization in plurality, whereas the uniqueness of the universe is nothing other than the consideration of the non-existence of the particularization of plurality. Thus, the uniqueness of the universe is particularized by the non-particularization in plurality. Because He is the One and the Unique. That is, it is because the *ḥaqq* is One and Unique Being, and from the point of view of the plurality of the images He is the universe. That is, from the point of view of the plurality of the images, that thing which is understood is the universe because it is number by being counted. Thus, the Uniqueness of the *ḥaqq* becomes circumscribed with shadow in otherness and becomes numerous by the number of the images and powers. Be discerning (perspicacious) and verify that which we have explained to you. Thus, the being of that which is understood being the Being of the *ḥaqq* by virtue of the Quiddity of the *ḥaqq*, and that by virtue of the differentiations of images in it it is the universe and other than the *ḥaqq*, which is verified and declared and which I have explained to you, be discerning in knowing this and understand it with its reality. And if the order is according to what I have mentioned to you, then the universe is conjectural and it has no real being. Thus, as it is not existent and present by its own self, in every aspect it cannot be other than the Being of the *ḥaqq*. Real being is for the *ḥaqq*. The attributive being is for the universe because the universe is the shadow of the Real Being and does not stand by its own self. Rather that the universe is present by the Being of that Ipseity of which it is the shadow. And this is the meaning of *khayâl*, that is, what was given to you to imagine that (that is, the universe) it is an additive order present by its own self outside of God. It is because it is imagined to be so that it is called *khayâl*. However, in the order itself the universe is not like that, that is to say, being outside

of God and present by its own self, that it is an additive order to God, because the universe is in itself imaginary (*khayâl*). There is no existence for it except the relationship of attachment to the Real Existent. Do you not see (that is, the shadow) in the senses, how it is attached to the person from which it extends, that it is impossible for it (that is, for the shadow) to separate itself from this attachment? Thus, it is impossible to imagine the separation of the shadow of a person from which the shadow extends, because the shadow is the same as that person and its ipseity, and it is no other than that, and it is not an additive order present by itself. It exists only by the existence of the person. Consequently, manifesting in the images which are one order of person and shadow, and through the imagining of difference between the person and its shadow because of that manifestation, the being of the shadow is imaginable. Now, just as it is impossible to imagine the separation of the shadow from its attachment to the person who is the owner of that shadow, in the same way it is impossible to imagine the separation from the *ḥaqq* of the light of being which extends from the Being of the *ḥaqq*. However, there is a difference between the attachment to the *ḥaqq* of the light of being, and the attachment of the shadow to a person, because the attachment of the shadow to a person in the senses is according to a determination of duality, whereas the attachment of the light of being, which is the being of the universe, to God, is according to a determination of uniqueness, because the attachment of the light of being to God is the attachment of the conditional (relative) to the Absolute, and the conditional or the relative is equally the same as the Absolute when it is attributable to that particularity by which it is relative. And know your *'ayn* (your established potentiality) and who you are and what is your quiddity, what is your relationship to God and by what you are the universe and other, and other than these whatever there is of words resembling these. Thus, know your established potentiality and know your being in the exterior and who you are and what is your quiddity, what is your relationship to God, and also by what manner are you God, by what thing are you the universe and other than God, and other words in the same manner. That is to say, know your essence which is established in the Divine Unknowableness, which is one of the things of God's Ipseity and an image from among the images of His Knowledge, that you are the Being of the *ḥaqq* which is manifested in the particularities of your established potentiality, and that your relationship to the *ḥaqq* is the relationship of the relative to the Absolute,

and like the relationship of the shadow to the person, and that also by virtue of your quiddity and your reality you are the *ḥaqq*, and that by virtue of your particularization and difference of appearance you are the universe, the other, and other than It. And in this knowledge the knowers are one superior to the other, and those who know and those who know more. In this knowledge the knowledgeable ones are one superior to the other in that some of them are knowledgeable and some of them even more knowledgeable, and this is due to the difference of the places of observation. Thus, the person who observed the particularization with the plurality observed the immanence, and that person who observed the Unique Being which is revealed in this image observed the *ḥaqq*, and that person who observed His face observed God and the immanence as two considerations, as the One Reality of the Ipseity is according to two aspects of consideration, and that person who observed the totality of pluralities as one reality, which are in plurality because of qualification and relationship, that is to say, observed the total with the Names and the Uniqueness with the Ipseity, that person is of the people of God who know God with true gnosis, and the person who observed the *ḥaqq* without the immanence is a person of state in the station of the collectivity with the station of *fanā'*, and the person who observed the *ḥaqq* in the immanence and the immanence in the *ḥaqq* is the one who has total witnessing in the station of remaining (*baqā'*) after *fanā'* with the uniqueness of the *'ayn* and differentiation after collectivity. This station is the station of rectitude (*istiḡāmat*), and the possessor of this is most learned of all, and God alone knows. And the *ḥaqq* in relationship to the particular shadow is small and big, and pure and most pure, which means that the Being of the *ḥaqq*, in relationship to the particular shadow, that is to say, because of the particular place of manifestation, is either big or small or pure or even purer, just as the light in relationship to the veils which veil the viewer from the outside according to what colour veils it, and colours it by its own colour, whereas in the order itself it has no colour. That is to say, the rays of the light, coloured behind the coloured glass, appear coloured, whereas in the order itself the light has no colour. Thus, if the glass is pure and clear, so is the light behind the glass in its original purity and remains uncoloured by any colour, and if the glass is tinted, the light also becomes tinted, but see it, you, like an example of your reality to your Lord, which means that even though the light in the order itself has no colour but becomes tinted with the colour of the glass, consider this as

an example of your Lord and your reality. You will see that your Lord, manifesting in the mirror of your reality, becomes coloured due to its particularity, whereas in itself it has no colour. Thus, if your reality is coloured due to its particularization through a particularity, in the same manner the Being of the *ḥaqq* is also coloured, and if your reality is pure and uncoloured, the manifestation of the Light of the Being of God happens in accordance with the Light of the *ḥaqq* as it is essentially.

They say that the colour of the water is that of its vessel.
The vessel has no colour now. I am of its water.
I am the pure place of manifestation to the Light of the
ḥaqq; that is why in me the *ḥaqq*
Manifested pure, as if I were of His Light.

And if you say the light is green from the greenness of the glass, you have said the truth and your witness is your senses, because you witness through your senses that the light behind the green-coloured glass is seen as green light and no other. And if you would say that it is not green and it has no colour, like the proof bestowed upon you, you have said the truth and your witness is the true intellectual vision. This is like that thing that proof bestows upon you and you are truthful in your determination in your words, and for it you have the true witnessing of the intellectual vision. What the intellectual vision bestows upon you of proof is that the light of the sun in the order itself is transcendent from the colour of the glass. And this is the light extended from the shadow, and that is the same as the glass. Thus, the light which extends from the light of the shadow which is related to the veil, which is pure and even purer, is light, and the shadow is the same as the glass. This is absolutely so, whether the glass is coloured or not coloured. And that is the shadow of light in its purity. That uncoloured light is the shadow of light manifesting in the uncoloured glass because of its purity. Thus, among some of us, the verifiers with God, manifests in purity the image of God in them more than it manifests in some others. That is to say, in the same way, in some of us who are verified with God from among the people of God, the image of God manifests more often because of their purity and luminosity, more often than the manifestation of the image in some of us who are not of that degree. And of us there are some where God is his hearing and vision and all his powers and all his surroundings, according to the indications that the law-giver informed from God. That is to say, there are some of us in whom God becomes his hearing, his sight and

all his powers and surroundings. And that the *ḥaqq* does become the servant's hearing and vision is established by such indications as the law-giver bestowed as information from God by way of narrating from God the High by the *ḥadīth qudsī* where it says: 'The servant does not deflect from approaching Me by supererogatories until I love him, and when I have loved him I have become his hearing and his sight', and other such indications. And with all this, the shadow exists, that is to say, although the *ḥaqq* is all the powers and the surrounds of the servant, the shadow itself which exists in the servant, is existent. (Note: that is to say, even when God has become the powers and the sight and the hearing of the servant, the shadow in the servant persists and that is what makes him a contingent. Even though his reality as God is manifest in him, he is at the same time a contingent, as the shadow is contingent to the origin of the shadow.) Because in fact the pronoun referring to the hearing applies (returns) to him. That is to say, because the pronoun which is in the word 'his hearing' refers to the servant. And the others of the servants who are not like this, the relationship is that this servant is closer to the Being of the *ḥaqq* than the relationships of the other servants. This means that of the servants other than this servant, who have not passed away from their qualities into the Quality of the *ḥaqq*, that is to say, God is not their powers and their surroundings, then the relationship of this servant to the Being of the *ḥaqq* is closer than the relationship of the servants who are not like this one.

Now, know it like this, that to be verified with God is of two parts. One part is that a person becomes verified with God and passes away from his own qualities into the Qualities of God, and God becomes present in the station of his qualities, and this servant is closer to God than other servants who are active in their own qualities and remain with the veiling of those qualities, and this closeness is called 'closeness of supererogatories', and it is to this category of closeness that the Shaykh (R.A.) refers when he says: 'And of us there are some where God is his hearing and vision' etc. The other part is called the 'closeness of obligations' which is closer than the previous closeness, because the closeness of this person is being essentially passed away and remaining with God, and God sees by him and hears by him and he is God's hearing and seeing. Perhaps even that he is the image of God, like Mohammed, praise and peace be upon him, for whom it was said: 'You did not throw when you threw, but God threw.' And as the order is as we have exposed to you, know that you are illusion (*khayāl*), and all that

you have known or understood and that you call 'other' (is equally illusion). (In certain copies one can read: *we are illusion, and all of being is illusion in illusion*). If the order is like we have explained to you, then the universe is illusory, since the existents have no real existence by their own being through their own selves, and they exist through the existence of the *ḥaqq*. Therefore, know for certain that you are illusory, and equally so, all that you know and understood, to which you refer as 'other than God', or what you call 'not my existence'. In short, the totality of existence which you imagine to be independent, is illusion within illusion. In other words, you are an illusion, therefore you are not existent and present through your own self. You are perhaps rather the image of the *ḥaqq* which is revealed in the mirror of your '*ayn*' which is established in the Divine Knowledge. Also, the image which is manifested in the mirror of the *ḥaqq* is illusion because it has no real existence outside the mirror. Equally, all things that are understood and are called 'other than the *ḥaqq*' are illusions. In fact, all of existence is illusion within illusion, because as you are an illusion in your own self, all relationships that you can imagine and conjecture other than the *ḥaqq* are illusion within illusion. Another aspect is this, that the image of the *ḥaqq* which is manifested in the mirrors of the '*a'yân*' where It reveals Itself over the potentialities is illusion, because that image is not seen outside the mirrors of the '*a'yân*'. They are illusioned in the mirror as the established potentialities, and their images and qualities are manifested in the images of the *ḥaqq* and reveal themselves to the '*a'yân*' equally as God, the *ḥaqq*, has been the mirror to the images of the '*a'yân*'. Thus also, the images which are seen in the mirror of the *ḥaqq* are illusion. Thus the first illusion is those images of the '*a'yân*' which are manifested in the mirror of the *ḥaqq*, and the second illusion is the image of the *ḥaqq* which is manifested in the mirrors of the '*a'yân*'.

All that there is in the immanence is either conjecture or
illusion,

Or reflection in mirrors, or shadows.

What is Man which is the reflection of the everlasting
Light?

What is the universe of waves in the sea of eternity?

The Being of the *ḥaqq* is not unless it is He, the God, especially by virtue of Its Ipseity and Its own '*ayn*'. The Being of the *ḥaqq*, that is, which is the Reality in the Ipseity Itself and thus established, is not

being except if it is the Being of God especially by virtue of Its Ipseity and Its own 'ayn, because the Ipseity of Uniqueness is the same as being and no other by virtue of the fact that being is solely being (*wujûd-i-mahd*). And the Reality of the *haqq* named by Its Ipseity of Uniqueness is no other than exclusively being, due to the fact that He is being without the condition of non-particularization and without the condition of particularization, and He is by virtue of Himself holy from all praise and Name. There is no praise for Him or Name, nor image, and there is no consideration of plurality in it by any aspect, and also not by virtue of His Names, because His Names have two connotations. The Reality of the *haqq* which is called by the Ipseity of Uniqueness is no other than solely being (*wujûd-i-mahd*), because of the fact that He is solely being without the condition of non-particularization and the condition of particularization. Equally, because the *haqq* is solely being He is transcendent from Qualities and Names, because for the *haqq* which is named by the Ipseity of Uniqueness there is neither image nor Name nor Quality, and no consideration is possible in any aspect for the plurality that It has in Itself, and this is because He is named by the Ipseity of Uniqueness and not because He is called by Names. From the point of view of the Ipseity, the Being of the *haqq* is the same as the Ipseity, and it is not the same as the Ipseity by virtue of the Names of the *haqq*, because for the Names of God there exist two connotations. One is the Ipseity, and the other is the Quality. One connotation is Its own 'ayn (the same as Itself). The first connotation is the Ipseity which is the same as the Name. And that is the named 'ayn. And the Name under this consideration is the same as what is called, that is to say, the Ipseity is the same as the *haqq*. Perhaps rather even that all the Names, being annihilated in the Ipseity and not being differentiated one from the other, are the same as each other, and as the Name is the same as what is called by that Name, under this consideration the Being of the Ipseity is the same as the *haqq*. The other connotation is that which denotes to it that which the Name details to it from this other Name and differentiates. The other connotation, which is a Quality, is that thing which the Name connotes so that this Name is differentiated from another Name, because in the Presence of Uniqueness the plurality of Names are annihilated and are the same as each other, but in the Presence of Oneness each Name becomes particularized by its own Quality and becomes differentiated one from the other. Perhaps as each Name by consideration of its particularization

and its differentiation by its Quality is other than the Ipseity which is qualified by all the Names in consideration of the fact that absolute is other than the relative. Where is the *ghafūr* from the Manifest and the Hidden, and where is the First from the Last? This means that in consideration of the meanings of the Qualities, the Names are differentiated one from the other. Thus, where is the Name *ghafūr* when you consider the Manifest and the Hidden, and where is the Name the First when you think of the Name the Last? That is to say, there is so much differentiation and disparity between God's being qualified by the Name *ghafūr* and His manifestation with the Name Manifest and the Name Hidden, and His Name the First and His Name the Last, thus in consideration of the meanings of the Qualities the Names remain differentiated one from the other, and thereby with the totality of the places of manifestation of the Names they are the shadows of the Divine Ipseity. The beings of things which are comprehensible beings are the manifestations of the Names with the images of the realities and the meanings of the Qualities of the *ḥaqq*. That is to say, the Being of the *ḥaqq* becoming the mirror to the images of realities and to the *a'yân*, the totality of the images of the *ḥaqq*, together with the meanings of the Qualities, become manifest in the mirror of the Being of the *ḥaqq* through the manifestation of the Names. Thus it has become established clearly to you how it is that all the Names are the same as the other Names. Thus it has become manifest to you under what consideration each Name from among the Divine Names is the same as another Name, and in which way each Name is different to another Name. That is to say, it became manifest to you that the Names are the same as the Ipseity of the *ḥaqq* and by virtue of denoting Him are one the same as the other. On the other hand, as each one of them denotes a Quality by which one Name is differentiated and separated from the other, they are not the same as each other. In that it is the same, it is the *ḥaqq*. That is to say, from the point of view that each Name is the same as the other Name, that Name is the Name of the Absolute *ḥaqq*, because in the Presences of the Singularity each Name is the same as the totality of the Names which is the same as the Ipseity. Consequently there each Name is the same as the other Names. In that it is the other, it is the imagined *ḥaqq* (that is the result of illusioning) in whose image we are. Under that consideration according to which that Name is other than the other Name, that Name is the 'illusioned *ḥaqq*' in whose image we are, since as one Name is other than the other Name, a Name cannot

be the same as the Absolute *ḥaqq*. Consequently, it becomes 'the illusioned *ḥaqq*' which is the particularization and the manifestation of the *ḥaqq* in the mirrors of the unknowable potentialities (*a'yân-i-ghaybiyyah*) due to the manifestation and particularization of the *ḥaqq* by virtue of the *a'yân*, or it is a particularization of the *a'yân* with the essential specialities in the Being of the *ḥaqq*. Consequently, the *ḥaqq* is Absolute by virtue of the Being of the Holy Ipseity, and by virtue of the Divine Names the *ḥaqq* is 'illusioned', imaginary. The Shaykh, with his words: 'The being, all of it is illusion in illusion', pointed this out. I transcend that which has no proof for It other than the proof of Its own Self, which means that I transcend that Absolute *ḥaqq* who has no proof other than Itself, because the quiddity (*huwiyyah*) of the universe is the shadow of the *ḥaqq* which proves It, connotes It. Equally, the shadow, by virtue of being Its shadow, is the same as that which gives the shadow. Consequently, there is no proof of the *ḥaqq* other than Its own Self. And His immanence is not proved. His Being is no other than the same as Itself. Thus, the Being of the *ḥaqq* is not established except by the sameness of Its Self, that is to say, by Its Ipseity, because that which is existent other than the Being of the *ḥaqq*, which is manifest and hidden, is not being. It is pure non-existence. Thus, the Being of the *ḥaqq*, which is the quiddity of all things, proves, connotes again only His own Being. Or it might be considered like this: His immanence is not established, that is to say, that immanence which is the creation of the *ḥaqq* manifest therein by His revelation, gave proof to It by no other than Its same Selfness and Its Ipseity and not by other than Himself from among the Names. That is to say, the immanence, which is the place of manifestation and the creation of the *ḥaqq*, does not establish proof of the Being of the *ḥaqq* except by the Ipseity of the *ḥaqq*. Consequently, the immanence, which is called other than the *ḥaqq* and which is named as the universes, is considered as proof to the Being of the *ḥaqq* only by the proof of the proof of the Ipseity of Its own Being, and it does not prove the Being of the *ḥaqq* by being existent and by being independent existence. And there is not in immanence other than which is proved by the Uniqueness. Thus, in immanence, that is to say, in being, there is no other proof of being other than the Being of the Uniqueness, and the being which is the subject of the proof of Uniqueness is the Being of the *ḥaqq*, because the Uniqueness which is the same as the *ḥaqq* does not prove except the Being of the *ḥaqq* which is the Uniqueness. Consequently, there is no being which proves the Being of

the *ḥaqq* other than His Being. And in the illusion there is not anything that proves it except plurality, which means that in illusion there is nothing other than plurality which proves it, because the plurality which proves it as established in the imaginary illusion which has no real being is the plurality of the Divine Names which are intellectualized in the Being of the Real One, and the plurality which is illusory and intellectualized proves nothing except the plurality which is illusory and illusion which is plurality. And he who stays with the plurality is with the universe and with the Divine Names and the Names of the universe. Thus, the person who remains between the pluralities and does not demand the oneness of the *ḥaqq*, remains with the universe, the Divine Names and the Names of the universe, which means that he remains at the level of plurality. Thus, he is veiled from the oneness of the *ḥaqq* by plurality. And he who remains with the Uniqueness of the Ipseity is with the *ḥaqq* by virtue of the fact that His Ipseity is Rich beyond Need of the universes, but not by virtue of Its image. And the person who remains at the level of the Uniqueness of the Ipseity, that is to say, his witnessing is that of the Uniqueness of the Ipseity, is forever with the *ḥaqq* by virtue of His being in no need of the universes. The image of the *ḥaqq*, that is to say, by virtue of His Qualities, is not the same as the *ḥaqq*, because the intellectuality of plurality is annihilated in the Ipseity of the Uniqueness. Thus the person who is in the witnessing of the Uniqueness of the Ipseity is at the place of manifestation of the Richness-beyond-Need of the Ipseity, and he is not at the place of manifestation of the images of the Names which necessitate plurality. And if He is (that is to say, the Uniqueness of the Ipseity) Rich beyond Need of the universes, it is as if His being Rich beyond Need of the universes is the same thing as His being Rich beyond Need of the relationships of the Divine Names, which means that His being Rich beyond Need of the universes is the same as His being Rich beyond Need of the relationships of the Names to Him. That is to say, being Rich beyond Need of the universes of the Ipseity of the Uniqueness is the same as His being Rich beyond Need of the relationships of the Names to Himself. Because the Names, just as they prove Him, prove also the other things which are named, and this is verified by their effects. Because that which proves the Ipseity of the Uniqueness, that is, though they prove the Ipseity, they also prove the other things named, that is to say, the realities of the Names which are the meanings of the Qualities, and it is thus that each Name is differentiated from another Name by its own reality. And that the

Names prove the other things named is verified by the effects of the Names which are the different images of the universe, because the differences between the effects of the Names prove the differentiation among the things named. Thus, the knowledge of the Names depends on the receptivities, the places of manifestation and the differences of effects. Equally, the realization of the being of the universe in the *a'yân* depends on the Names and the Presences of the Names. In short, by way of mutual relationship they are dependent one on the other. As there is no being rich beyond need of one of them from the other, being rich beyond need of one of them would necessitate being rich beyond need of the other. Thus, being rich beyond need of the universes is the same as being rich beyond need of the Names. In the same way, when the universes are considered as the images of the Divine Names, then it becomes clearly manifest that being rich beyond need of the universes is the same as being rich beyond need of the Names because the universes are no other than the images of the Names, and that the Ipseity of Uniqueness is absolutely Rich beyond Need of any other thing is clear in the words of the *ḥaqq*: 'Say: He is the God.' 'Say: He is the God, the Unique' by virtue of Its '*ayn*. That is to say, Oh Mohammed say: The Being of the *ḥaqq* by virtue of the Ipseity of the *ḥaqq* is the God, the Unique, Rich beyond Need of other. God is Self-subsistent, yet what is relied upon in the needs and needed by virtue of our relying upon Him. That is to say, God is what is relied upon or intended in needs and the needed by virtue of our relying upon Him. Thus, in consideration of the Name *ṣamad*, the Being of the *ḥaqq* is One, that is to say, not Rich beyond Need of the Names, because *ṣamad* is needed, and that which is needed cannot be realized in the exterior without those who need it. Thus, in consideration of Oneness, the Being of the *ḥaqq* is not Rich beyond Need of the Names. By virtue of His own Quiddity and us, He did not bear. The *ḥaqq* did not bear by virtue of the necessarily-so-ness of His Quiddity and by virtue of the possiblens of our quiddity. That is to say, He did not take friendship from our quiddity and did not bring forth from His and our quiddities. Therefore, He cannot be a progenitor, and the words: 'There is nothing equal to Him' proves this, and in the words of the Shaykh that follow, this is very clearly put down. And He did not bring forth (give birth) as there is no other thing unique equal to Him. Thus, by virtue of His Quiddity the *ḥaqq* was not born from anybody so that He could be a result of anything. Equally, not one is equal or exchangeable or similar to Him, so that it be close

to Him, so that from their beginning generality become existent. This is because He is total by virtue of encompassing. And this is, that is to say, by virtue of His Ipseity, the Uniqueness is His praise. That is to say, Uniqueness, by virtue of Ipseity, is the praise of the *ḥaqq*. Or else, this is—that is to say, that which is mentioned in this *sūrat* is—His praise. That is to say, that which is mentioned in this *sūrat* is the praise of the *ḥaqq*. He singularized His Ipseity by the words ‘God, the Unique.’ That is to say, He declared that His Ipseity is singular and transcendent from plurality, and He manifested His plurality by His praises known by us. That is to say, by His known praises which are the attributes of negation, plurality became manifest at our level by virtue of our being qualified by those praises, and we are born and we bring forth and we are dependent upon Him, and we are equal, some of us to some others of us. Thus we are parents and we bear children and we depend on Him, etc. And this One is transcendent from these praises and He is Rich beyond Need of these, just as He is Rich beyond Need of us. This One, in consideration of the Ipseity of Uniqueness and Oneness of ‘*ayn*, is transcendent of these praises. Thus, this One Being is Rich beyond Need of these praises, just as He is Rich beyond Need of us because we are qualified by these praises, and by virtue of Ipseity the *ḥaqq* is Rich beyond Need of us. Thus, in the best of ways the *ḥaqq* becomes Rich beyond Need of the qualities which are manifest among us, and the *ḥaqq*, by virtue of the very self of being Rich beyond Need in His Ipseity, is transcendent from the plurality of the relationships of Names and from the plurality of the existences of the possible. There is no quality in consideration of His Essential Richness-beyond-Need for the *ḥaqq* except the *Sūrat* of *Ikhlâṣ*. This *sūrat*, being specialized for the establishment and proving of the quality of Uniqueness, removes the veil of plurality from the face of the Ipseity of Uniqueness. Therefore, it is equal to a quality of Uniqueness, and it is thus that it was brought down. That is to say, the *Sūrat* of *Ikhlâṣ* was brought down for the qualification of the Uniqueness which is the quality of the *ḥaqq*. The Shaykh (R.A.) in his introduction to the *Futūḥât*: ‘The Jews said to Mohammed (S.A.): “Qualify your Lord for us”, and God brought down this *Sūrat* of *Ikhlâṣ* and established for them a real proof, one from among proofs of vision, and said: “Say: He is God” and established His being Unique and refuted all number, and established His Uniqueness to God to whom is praise and who is Self-subsistent, and refuted body (was not born and did not bear) and refuted parenthood and being born, and by: “There

is not one equal in uniqueness to Him" refuted an equal, just as it refuted partner.' And in chapter 59 of the *Futûhât*: 'His *mashî'a* and His Will and His Knowledge and His Power is of Himself, the High God, and becomes plural in Himself, High and Grand, though He is absolutely One, and when they asked of the Prophet (S.A.) of His Qualities, the *Sûrat* of *Ikhlâs* came down and freed Him of any association with another.' And the completion of the freedom of the *haqq* is negating from Him all qualities of plurality and establishing His Essential Uniqueness. Yet all uniquenesses are not the praises of the Ipseity of the *haqq*. The Uniqueness which is related to the Ipseity is the Uniqueness of the '*ayn*, and it is not the Uniqueness of the plurality of the Divine Names. That is why the Shaykh (R.A.) pointed at these two Uniquenesses and said: The Uniqueness of God by virtue of the Divine Names required us, and this is the Uniqueness of plurality, which means that the Uniqueness of God by virtue of the Divine Names required us for manifesting in us the effects of the Names in the plurality of Uniqueness, because that which is named by all these many Names is One by virtue of Essence, and by virtue of the relationship appertaining to His Ipseity It is plural in relationships. Consequently, to this plurality of relationships which is in the Intellect is applied the Name 'Uniqueness of plurality'. And the Uniqueness of God by virtue of His being Rich beyond Need of us and of the Divine Names, it is the Uniqueness of the '*ayn*. This Uniqueness is also the Uniqueness of the Ipseity wherein a mentation of plurality cannot be considered. Consequently, the Uniqueness of the Ipseity necessitates being Rich beyond Need of the Divine Names and also of the immanences which are the necessities of the Names. Consequently, the Uniqueness which is transcended beyond plurality is the Uniqueness of Ipseity and not the Uniqueness of the Names. And to all of them is applied the Name Unique, and know this like that. The Uniqueness which is related to the Ipseity is the Uniqueness of the '*ayn* and not the Uniqueness of the Names; thus, know you the difference and the distinction between these two Uniquenesses, so that you be not questionable in their usage, and use each one in their own station. And God did not bring into being the shadows and bring them prostrating, (so that they are spread on the earth and docile to the *haqq*), transient (going towards) from the left (towards the right at sunset) and from the right (towards the left at the elevation of the sun) except as proofs for you of you and of Him. Thus the High God did not bring into being the shadows for the people outside, and equally did not bring the

shadows outspread upon the earth from the people, prostrating and docile, going from left to right at sunset and right to left at sunrise, except to bring into being proofs for you, for yourself and for your being, and for His Being, so that you take them as proofs for your existence and for the Being of the *ḥaqq*. So that you know who you are and what is your relationship to Him and what is His relationship to you. In other words, so that you know that those existents which are particularized, from among which you are a being, that you are an illusory shadow and your relationship to the *ḥaqq* is like the relationship of the shadow to the person from whom the shadow extends, because the relative being and the particularized one extends from the Absolute Being and exists and is present by It. The relationship of the *ḥaqq* to you is like the relationship of the person to the shadow, and your being is present and existent with the Being of the *ḥaqq* in a state of docility to His order by which He attracts you to Himself, and you are attracted and docile to His Will and you have no other being or freedom other than Him, just as if the man did not have height there would be no shadow to him. Until you know from whence or from whom, by which all that is other is qualified by this Divine Reality with total poverty in God, and with relative poverty to Him by the need of some to others, which means that you should know by which degree or from what Divine Reality is qualified by total poverty to the Being of the *ḥaqq* all that is other than the *ḥaqq*, from which Divine Reality other than the *ḥaqq* became qualified with relative poverty to the Being of the *ḥaqq* by virtue of some of them being in need of the others!

Now, know it like this, that the particularized beings which are the shadows of the *ḥaqq* which are other than the *ḥaqq*, are in need of the Ipseity which is called God, who is the one who brings into being, who makes present, who is the Lord and who is the Light. By virtue of the fact that they have not in themselves any freedom due to their being the ones who worship as existents, and by virtue of the fact of the darkness of the potentialities who are in non-existence through being the servants of the Lord, and in the same way, the need of that which is other than God for God, is total poverty. The relative poverty is this, that the need of some of us for the others refers to the need that we have to the Being of the *ḥaqq*, because the need of the universe to the universe is not due to the darkness of the universe, but rather perhaps due to the manifestation of the *ḥaqq* in it with Lordship. And by virtue of Lordship the universe is the same as the *ḥaqq* and not the shadow.

Thus, the poverty or need is to nobody other than God. Until you know from whence or from what Reality the *ḥaqq* is qualified with being Rich beyond Need from the humankind and Rich beyond Need of the universes, and that the universe is qualified with being rich beyond need, and what makes some of the humankind rich beyond need from some of the others, and in what aspect he is the same as the one who is in need of some others. That is to say, so that you come to know from which degree and from what Divine Reality the *ḥaqq* became Rich beyond Need, of the people and of the universes, and became qualified by being Rich beyond Need. And the universe also became qualified as rich beyond need. That is to say, some of the universe became qualified with being rich beyond need from the others, from that aspect where the aspect of being rich beyond need is the same as some being in need of the others. That is to say, some of the universe became rich beyond need of a thing in one order, and in that order became in need of another portion in another thing. It is like the shadow of a person which in being is in need of the person, but it is rich beyond need from another person, and the fact that it is rich beyond need from another person is the same as its being needy of its own person. It is rather that some parts are in some aspects rich beyond need of other parts, and they are in need through some aspects of some others. This is like cooled and frozen water being rich beyond need of the sun, yet in need of the heat for its being able to flow. It can also be interpreted as that it becomes rich beyond need in one of the aspects of the aspects, and that aspect by which it is in need of another. Another interpretation would be as if this aspect which is the same as its need of another. Thus the *ḥaqq*, in consideration of the Uniqueness of Its Ipseity, is Rich beyond Need of people and the universes, and in consideration of the manifestation of the *ḥaqq* in the places of manifestation of the universe, and His Lordship, some of the universe is rich beyond need of some others, because in another place of manifestation it is in need of the *ḥaqq* by a relative (qualificative) need. In consideration of causality the universe is in need of its own kind. It is without a doubt indeed that the universe is in need, by essential need, of causes, because the universe is in accordance with non-existence. Therefore, there is no original existence for it because in existence it is in need of a cause. And the greatest cause for it is the quality of the cause (*sababiyyah*), the *ḥaqq*. That is to say, when one does not take into consideration the quality (*nisab*), our beings and existences are in need of the *ḥaqq* by an essential need though they are present with the revelation and the Names of the

One Absolute Being which is present by Its own Ipseity. And there is no quality of the cause for the *ḥaqq* by which the universes are in need of Him other than the Divine Names, such as the Bringer into Existence (*mūjid*) and Lord (*rabb*) and Creator (*khâliq*), because the universe is in need of qualities such as bringing into existence, Lordship and creativity, and others like these. Thus, the need is for being brought into existence, and nourishment and being created. However, the realities of Ipseity are images of essential particularizations and are affairs of the Ipseity. There is no consideration of need by virtue of the Ipseity of Unknowableness. Thus, being in need is in the area of the Names which are qualities of which we are the images. And the Divine Names are each a Name which the universe is in need of, from a universe equal to it or the same as the *ḥaqq*. The Divine Names are each of the Names of which the universe is in need, whether that Name which is in need be similar to that which is in need in the universes, just as the child is in need of the parents in being and nourishment and protection, or else, be it from the same as the *ḥaqq*, like its need of the Creator, the Fashioner *ḥaqq* in creation or formation or in image. This is to say, everything which is in the encompassing of the Name Manifest, which are the things of the immanential manifestations and creatural universes, each of these is a Divine Name by two considerations. One consideration is that everything in existence leads to the Being of the *ḥaqq* and His Oneness, thus it becomes a Divine Name. Whereas the other consideration is this, that everything that is in existence is a place of manifestation, revelation and an all-encompassing throne for a quality for one Name from among the Divine Names whereby that Name manifests in that place of manifestation the Lordship of that Name. As each Name manifests its own Lordship in its particular private place of manifestation, and by consideration of the witnessing of the uniqueness of manifestation and the place of manifestation, each thing becomes a Divine Name, and it is manifest that all the particularizations of knowledge and the realities of the Unknowable which are within the encompassing of the Name Interior are Divine Names. And He is the God and no other. Thus the Name to which all need is, is the Name God; from the aspect of Lordship it is no other. Yet the quality of the cause of the parent to the child is not by virtue of its established potentiality, because established potentiality is non-existent. Rather that it is by virtue of being and action and strength and ability, because being is the same as the *ḥaqq* which is manifest in the place of

manifestation, and action and ability and strength and nourishment with protection are the subjects of being and are the qualities and actions of the *ḥaqq*. Thus, for the parent there is nothing else but receptivity and ability and being the place of manifestation, and in his being the place of manifestation that which is manifested as action is the action of God. Without a doubt the quality of causality of the same as the *ḥaqq* has become manifest so that there is nothing other than God which is needed. He is by Himself. There is no associate to Him, and it is because of this that God the High said: 'Oh people, you are in need of God, and God, He is Rich beyond Need and to whom all praise is due', which means, the High God by His Ipseity is Rich beyond Need of anything else and gives praise by His own Ipseity to His Ipseity. In other words, need is your essential quality, and being Rich beyond Need is the essential quality of the *ḥaqq*. Thus, He made it clear that the people have no richness-beyond-need in the order itself, and that they are in need of the High God in total need in every order through their essential need, and that He, through His Ipseity and perfections and Qualities, is the one that is praised. And it is known that there is for us need of some of us for others of us, and that our Names are the Names of God. This means that our need of some of us for some others of us is the Divine Names which are ours, by which Names the High *ḥaqq* has revealed Itself to us. Thus our Names are God's Names and that we are only the images of the Names, and that there is nothing in us that will need anything other than the *ḥaqq*. (He is the Rich-beyond-Need and we are the poor.) Being in need is without a doubt being in need of Him, and our potentialities (*a'yân*) in the order itself are no other than shadow, because need is without a doubt only to God specifically and to no other, yet our potentialities in the order itself are the shadow of God. That is to say, our potentialities in the order itself, which are the informations from the Unknowable, are His shadow. In consideration of His Name Interior (*bâṭin*) it is no other than shadow, because in consideration of the qualities and relativities of the interiors the Name Interior is the same as the *ḥaqq*, and the shadow of the *ḥaqq* through conditional qualification is His Being. Otherwise said, our potentialities, that is to say, our external beings, are the shadow of the *ḥaqq* in the order itself. Our being in need of the *ḥaqq* is just like the need of the shadow for the person whose shadow it is. And He is our quiddity and not our quiddity. Thus the *ḥaqq*, in consideration of reality and being, is our quiddity. Through particularization and relativity and being

conditional and by consideration of qualification, He is not our quiddity, because the absolute is not the same as the relative by virtue of its absoluteness. We have in fact led you to the right way, thus see! Thus, in this chapter on Joseph, in the matter of detailing the Presence of *khayâl* within the subject of the detailing of the Presence of illusion, we have led you to the Way of Oneness and the Way of Reality. Thus, look with the eye of vision and the eye of the uniqueness of witnessing, and follow the Way in accordance until you witness the beauty of Uniqueness in the images of the places of manifestation of all things, so that you be not veiled by the plurality of the images of the relative universe from the knowledge of the Ipseity of Uniqueness. Praise to God, the Lord of the Universes.

Of the Wisdom of Uniqueness (*al-ḥikmat al-aḥadiyyah*) in the Word of Hud

For the Singleness of Existence (*waḥdat-i-wujūd*), there are established three degrees. The first of these is the Singleness of the Ipseity which is the Absolute Uniqueness (*aḥadiyyah*) of Ipseity, and in this, as we know, there is no relative plurality nor plurality of existences, nor consideration even of these. The second of these is the Singleness of Names with the plurality of Qualities, and this is the Singleness of Godhead, and with this consideration God is One (*wāḥid*), and with the former, God is Unique (*aḥad*). The third degree is Singleness of action which is the Uniqueness of Lordship (*aḥadiyyat-i-rubūbiyyah*). It is this Uniqueness (*aḥadiyyah*) which is specialized in the prophet Hud, God keep him in *salām*. But, this Uniqueness is both taken and given and arrested, that is, it is arrested in the fact that at this moment the Lord is according to a special way and that God proceeds in that special way. Therefore, this Uniqueness is the Uniqueness of the plurality of actions and results which is related directly to the *huwiyyah* of Ipseity.

Now know it thus, that the straight way is the way of Singleness because God is One, and this is the shortest way of the ways that arrive at God. Because for each Name of God there is a special servant for whom that Name is its special Lord and that servant is the place of manifestation of that quality. The servant is apparent (*zāhir*) and the body, and the *rabb* is hidden (*bāṭin*) and the spirit, because each *nafs* of each *a'yân* of being is attached to one special Name of the Names of God and depends on it and it acts according to the necessity of that Name. Therefore, each *'ayn* goes according to its special straight path and its Lord is according to that straight path. However, each *'ayn* is on the straight path according to its private Name and not according to a Name which is its equivalent. Oneness is reached through any one of these Names because of the relativity in immanence in this world, but the Uniqueness of all the ways, which is the straight way, is the Name of *Allāh* which is the special Name for the Ipseity of Godhead,

and this is reached by the way which is the way of Mohammed and all other prophets and saints of different natures and qualities, because this is the manifestation point of Godhead. There is not an atom in all existence which is not existent through His Ipseity (*dhât*), and this Ipseity (*dhât*) is manifested through a Name so that that Name is the spirit of that which is manifested and its regulator, and that which is manifested is its image. Hence, all existents are on the straight path. Which means that as God's Ipseity is existent in all small or big existents, His *rahmah* covers all things no matter how small or big. Because *rahmah* has expanded by its emanation which is not emanation, over all Names and *a'yân*; and all that is individuated is endured through its action and all the different ways are differentiated in and through it, therefore all that which moves according to a way returns to Him anyhow.

The Wisdom of Uniqueness of the prophet Hud is proven by the Quranic saying: 'There is not a single creature whom *Hû* (He) does not hold by his forehead because your Lord is on the straight path.' Hence, all those who travel or are attached to any of the paths finally result in Him, because, according to this Quranic saying, we have seen there is not a single existent whom the *huwiyyah* of Uniqueness does not hold by his forehead and possess it by the order of Absoluteness of Self-Subsistence (*şamad* and *qayyûm*).

The reason why he has called it not 'people' but 'creatures' is because for those who know, all things are imbued at that level with the word *hayy*, which denotes that the *huwiyyah* of *haqq* is contagious to (in contact with) all the Divine Names and places of manifestation of these Names.

If then every existent is anyhow on the straight path, what is the point and use of inviting them (*da'wah*)? This one cannot say, because this invitation is the invitation from the Name *muđill* (Misleader) to the Name *hâdi* (Guide) to Truth, and the invitation from the Name *jabbâr* (Compeller, Enforcer) to the Name *'adl* (the Just).

There is not in manifestation a single being that has not a speech, because that which manifests and that which is differentiated in that manifested existent is no other than *haqq*. Hence, in that existent is manifested that *haqq* who speaks to him in that truth, and that which is manifested is consequently speaking according to that truth. There is not a single existent in the manifested world which is not speaking with the *haqq* that is manifested in it, and *haqq* does not manifest in

manifestation without that manifestation being through one of Its Names, and each Name is qualified by all the other Names because *ḥaqq* cannot be fragmented, whereas the places, that is, those who are manifested, are in certain respects fragmented. And if God does manifest as a medium through 'all-nesses', He therein manifests with all His Names and that place of manifestation is like the Perfect Man. But if He manifests not as a medium in all things, that particular manifestation is not a medium to all things and He is outside all that and that thing is eloquent with only seven things named and the other Names are in its *bâtin* and cannot be expressed, like in the relative man. And if He is going to be manifested in a constrained manner, the speech also will remain interior to that which is manifested, like in solids and plants. Therefore, if there is no manifestation of all Names and Qualities in a manifested thing, the Names and Qualities remain interior because of the lack of ability in the manifested thing's nature to express itself. Therefore, there is not a single creature who is not speaking, be it manifestedly or interiorly. Those things in whom speech is interior, their speech and giving of grace to Truth is through their manner. Most people call this speaking their non-speech, but those who see things as they really are and have *kashf* open, hear speech both of the hidden and the manifested kinds, but those who are veiled cannot hear.

Hence all things are speaking things, even though in some the speech is hidden, because that which actually produces speech is non-existent in them. Therefore, speech in those things is *bâtin* and everyone does not hear. The veiled one does not hear, but the one whose veils are removed and is *kâmil* does see, hear, the spirituality of every thing and does hear, in manifested speech or not, their language.

There is not in existence one creature that the eye sees who is not in his 'ayn and essence the *ḥaqq*, which has appeared manifested in that image. But the imaginations of the veiled ones call them creatures, because they are covered in creatural form and are veiled by it. But to the ones who know, *ḥaqq* is manifested through that image. Therefore the appearance of the images of *ḥaqq* in forms of creatures is likened to invitations inside envelopes. The manifestations of creatures are like the envelopes wherein is held the Truth in Truth of manifestation though they be the immanencing of the Divine manifestation; (the Arc of *wujûb*, and the Arc of *imkân*).

Know it thus, that the (re-)realization of the Divine tastes of knowledge which exist for people of God, is varied because of the

varieties of powers, because Divine knowledges are resultant in that man; then that power is that which is special, individual, to him, even though it is related to the One and Single Ipseity. The one whose power of vision is stronger than that of hearing, is not the same as the one whose power of hearing is stronger than that of vision, and the powers are the servants of a degree of appearance of mankind and they possess that degree and keep it. The man is the manifestation of those human powers through which the knowledge is related to him.

The reason for the existence of differences of receptions and receptors of knowledge of Divine tastes is because of this, because of differences of powers, and because of these powers the knowledges are related to the appearance of Man, and totality of knowledges is referred to in the Single One in the One '*ayn* which is the Reality of the Uniqueness of the humankind, or it is the '*ayn-i-thâbita* of that person, or it is the Ipseity manifested in that person, or it is the Absolute Ipseity, or it is the source of all the powers which is the *huwiyyah* of the One '*ayn*. Therefore, the differences of the Divine Knowledge in the existences of each individual of the people of God is due to the difference of the person's powers, just as the existence of each of the people of God is united in the totality of the powers of the Divine and Complete Reality of Realities of appearance of mankind. Although there are individual differences in each of these, they are all in reference to One '*ayn*, which is the *huwiyyah* of Truth of Divine Ipseity, and all knowledges and tastes emanate from that Uniqueness because all Knowledge is a Single Truth in Him, even though the places of manifestation are different, that is, they appear to be different. It is because of this that Shaykh Mu'ayyad Jundi said: 'For some there is, according to their inclination, a manner of the same Truth, whereas for some, God is their hearing and vision, and to others it is individuated differently according to time and level, whereas the *huwiyyah* of what they have received is exactly the same in each.' In this case thou shalt see that what he means by powers is the power of Divine Spiritual Light, which is in the humankind a dominant factor, and which results in that each of these people of God have attracted a specialized brand in appearance of the same Truth, and there is no limit to differences.

When God has said: 'I become their hearing and vision and the hand and feet, etc.' it means that He who is Singular and non-divisible, His Ipseity accords with the limitation of the person. The result is that in one person the *kan.âl* appears this way, which does not appear in

another person of *kamâl* in the same way, although the *huwiyyah* of Ipseity remains the same.

(Muḥyiddin Ibn 'Arabi likens this truth to water which takes on the shape of the container; and sometimes the water is salty, bitter or different, whereas the quality of waterness remains equal and water in essence remains the same though it tastes different from different wells.)

In the same way, though there are limitless differentiations, the Reality does not vary. Therefore, whoever studies knowledge becomes knowledgeable whether it be useful or not useful; they each absolutely receive knowledge. Although the knowledge is in every 'thing' (*shay'*), the people mentioned in this book, though different in expression, express the same indivisible Truth.

Therefore everybody who is distanced from the Reality is in hell: the good man, if he is away from his reality, is in hell; the vengeful man, who becomes merciful, is in hell. When then God takes a person who is in his 'ayn manifested with the winds of hell and leads him to his homeland, which is hell, with that leading into hell, they become annihilated in their own existence, and they have reached their destination. The 'ayn is annihilated, taken away from individuation, therefore distance is eliminated and in their case what was qualified as hell has become non-existent, and if distance is eliminated, hell, which is distance from Reality, is eliminated. But, though they have reached the elimination of hell, it does not mean they have reached the Absolute where there is no qualification. Now understand that *ḥaqq* did not give them this situation because they deserved it as a gift from God, but because they took it due to what they deserved according to their actions, which actions were those upon which they were established due to their personal ability and due to their *a'yân* which in the Presence of His Knowledge were already known; because no matter what their actions appeared to be upon this world, it was all the same in accordance with their *a'yân* and thereby they were on the straight path with their foreheads in the Hands of Him Who Guides in the straight path. Here it appears that there was coercion (*jabr*), but the *jabr* does not refer to the Hand which holds them by the forehead and leads them, but to the propensity of their 'ayn, and it is this *jabr* of the 'ayn through the propensities of their 'ayn that they asked from the Absolute *rabb*, the *ḥukm*, determination of the private *rabb*; and their arrival thereby at the closeness of 'ayn is not to do with the degree of their closeness to the Ipseity but it is determined rather by the Quranic saying: 'We are

closest to them, but you do not see it... Which means that since you (people) are in the relative world of life, your eyes are not yet open to see the situation of these people, who have passed into another existence. Which means the dead can see this closeness, proximity, better than the living can, because the vision of the dead is cleared of the nature of relativity and devoid of qualities of *nafs* and miseries of being an ordinary human being. And where it says in the Quran: 'Those who were blind before, shall be equally resurrected blind on the Day of Judgement', is not contrary to this, as this reference is not to those we have mentioned, but to those whom the *hâdi* has invited to the Absolute *rabb*, which is the *rabb* of the Perfect Man, and who did not comply. And this blindness refers not to the blindness of the eye, but to the blindness of the heart.

Then it is obvious, because of all the quotes we have brought and explained, that the *huwiyyah* of *haqq* being the same as the powers of the '*abd*', there is no closer than this closeness, since the '*abd*' is no other than these powers and limbs. The '*abd*' has no other body, nor existence, than these powers and limbs. So the '*abd*' is the visible *haqq* in the imagined *khalq*; that is, that which manifests in the *khalq*, which is imaginary, is the *haqq*. Because in the mirrors of the *a'yân-i-thâbita*, that which manifests from the *a'yân* of the *haqq* is only the image, manifestation, *khalq*, which is visible.

For the believers and the people of *kashf* (insight), for both of these, because one has the *kashf*, the other has the belief in those who have the *kashf*, *khalq* is intellectually existent: it has no existence as such and is only the relative reflection of the *a'yân*, and a relative reflection is only an intellectual, speculative condition and has no existence, and *haqq* is known through feeling and visible. But with philosophers and teachers, who are the people of veils, it is the reverse: the manifestation is visible and *haqq* is intellectual and they cannot see Him.

It is in the *asfal-i-sâfilîn* that *tahqiq-i-haqq*, establishing the Real, begins. For the man who is in the *asfal-i-sâfilîn* must know even there that there is no existent but God. (The only Real, and Reality, is Him.)

The manifestation of the Divine Ipseity is through seven leaders; the first of which is *hayy*. That which is in *hayy* renders grace and is in existence. Anything that is not in *hayy* is non-existent. Every section of the four layers of existence is able to render grace through the possibility of being alive through *hayy*, but *hayy* is not active in manifestation which is only a reflection of the real *hayy*. The *hayy* which causes *muhyyi*

is the one which obliges one to recognize the Source. The people of Hud who were killed and were taken away from relative life, but were left in the origin of *ḥayy*, what was their body, tongue, foot, etc., are all then under the Name of *ḥayy*, their essence. That is, when you are dead, every part of your body is speaking in life (*ḥayy*). So denial is useless of one's previous acts. If you say in the next world: 'I did not hit this man', the hand will say: 'I hit him by the order of the brain that ruled me', so every atom will be speaking. *Ahl-i-kashf* can hear everything speaking, making sound, etc.

The wind that killed everybody during the night, and in the morning only their bodies were found, was both a punishment and a mercy; (the destruction of the people of Hud).

It is only at the station of Man that there is otherness between what is imagined as creature and what is known as God. God says: 'I am in manifestation, I am that which is manifested', but when it comes to Man, He does not say that, He keeps it secret. Only mankind has to discover it for themselves, and only people of *kashf* know this. If it were not so, then He could not have said: 'I am all existence.' There is a section of the multitude of existents who are differentiated from Him until by their own efforts, they come to know Him. Everything is Him, and knows it; but there is a category who are in His image but do not know that He is all. The only ones who do not know until *kashf* are the ones in His image.

And this otherness, individuated in animals, plants and rocks, is the secret of the individuation of human beings. Therefore, certain things are forbidden to Man. If it were not so, then it would no longer be a secret, for if the secret of 'I am Truth, I am God' were known, then He would have manifested His Ipseity in everything, and His mystery would not have been known.

Things speak in *bâṭin* and Man speaks outwardly. And it is this differentiation from the human being which creates the possibility of the word 'you'. For lesser than humans, there is no 'you', only oneness. As the thing is hidden (from you) it becomes 'Thou'. Consequently, every man is not in the same degree of consciousness of the Reality. A section of human beings is un-knowing, not gnostic, and another part is gnostic. Therefore, there has been for each kind and category and era of people a different envoy. 'God made appear to me the *a'yân* of all the *anbiyâ*' from Adam to Mohammed, who are human beings, and showed me their spirit and pointed out to me that these were human

beings, keeping aside the angelic envoys and other categories of envoys. And that for each category of existence other than human beings, there was an envoy in their category which was a link between them and God. He showed this to me in Cordova in the year 586 (hegira), in which year I was made to be present in that place of vision, that is to say, God made me stationed in that *maqâm* and degree, and this vision happened to me in that place of vision. And nobody except Hud, from among that company, spoke to me in that place, and he explained to me the purpose of their meeting.' The reason why it was that Hud spoke was because the ways and tastes (*mashrab* and *dhawq*) of Hud were the most suitable in the ways of *tawhîd*, Unity in plurality, and the width of *maqâm* of *kashf*, and the images of actions and in the observation of the works of the Truth. And Hud invited 'Arabi to this meeting of all the prophets and envoys, in the *ḥaḍrah* of the Reality of Mohammed, because 'Arabi is the Seal of Sainthood and the heir to the sealness of the Seal of the Prophets and also because he is the *quṭb* of *quṭbs* (*quṭb-ul-aqṭâb*). He says: 'And I saw Hud to be a man large among men, who is sweet of countenance, his conversation subtle (*laṭîf*), pleasurable and light, a gnostic of all *amr* and a *kâshif* having insight into them, and my main indication that Hud had this *kashf* into the orders was that he quoted to me from the Quran this verse: "There is no creature whom He (God) does not hold by his forehead (forelock), because indeed my Lord is on the straight path." And this he mentioned to prove to me, by bringing in the testimony of the Quran, that God (*ḥaqq*, Truth) is the same as all the creatures of the world. He did not categorize nor differentiate one thing from the other and specially did not demonstrate other than the fact that God through the *huwiyyah*, Ipseity of the plurality of His Uniqueness, holds by the forehead all the individuations which are the individuations of the indefinite number of possibilities, and that each of the indefinite number of possibilities goes on the way towards his private Lord; making that which is of God, individuated in themselves, their Lord (*rabb*) in the World of Truth; and that God, Truth, indeed, is "the beginning and the end and the *zâhir* and the *bâṭin* and the manifested and the secret". (Therefore note that there is nothing in individuation whose forehead is not held by God in manifestation, and there is nothing in the interior of the realities of the unknown which is not on the way of manifestation.) And for the creation there is no *beshara* (good tidings) greater than this, that Hud with the word of Truth, announced that Truth, God, is the Ipseity of all 'things'.

God is the same as all the senses, because through the senses *hayy* exposes itself; yet spiritual sense is even a degree closer. We know that God said that spirit is an order from your God. Now, an order is not a creature. We also know that the universes are an order; therefore, they are not a creature. Creatures are limited but universes are not limited, and *amr* is not limited. The creature is a result of *amr*. The *rûh* is unlimited. That which is unlimited is naturally closer than that which is limited. That is why the Prophet told us from God, as a good tiding, that God said: '*idh taqarraba ilayya 'abdî bil-nawâfil kuntu sam'ahu wa başarahu*', which translates: 'When My servant approaches Me with things I have not imposed upon him (*nawâfil*), I am his hearing and his seeing.' And thereby informed us of the *bashara* that Truth, *haqq*, is the same as our powers. An imposed order is limited, but unlimited actions for Him naturally brings you closer. People who deny this are those who do not see and understand that if God is the same as the restricted things, God becomes restricted, and if God includes all spirits and bodies and is individuated in all these things, He cannot be limited, and appears in all, and separately and more; therefore He is unlimited. Those who do not understand cover up our Reality, and those who do not understand cover up our proofs; they are stricken with jealousy and miserliness and oppressions, (and are oppressors, and oppression is in darkness), because these things are in their *nafs*. Those who know God's evidences with partial knowledge, know it only because in their *nafs* is all this negativity. This is very often met with in knowledgeable people of *ahli kitâb*, because they know the evidences of Truth through their books. Even their very elegant students of the books try to bring in as many proofs as possible to try to deny this because of the existence of their jealousy and miserliness and oppression which are inherent in their *nafs*. Ibn 'Arabi argues that what all these people see in the books is the curtailing of the Unlimitedness of God, and he refutes it by the Prophetic saying: 'Above the '*ama*, it is not air, and below the '*ama*, it is not air', which shows that there is no possibility of limiting the '*ama*. And he proves that in the Quran many things are limitations, but people must go beyond that. When in the Quran it says: 'We brought it down on the Night of Power', this is a limitation, but those who stand on those words are limiters. Whereas it is us who limit Him, He is unlimited. To absolutize from relativity is also relativity, and to say of the Absolute 'Absolute', is also a limitation. But all the same, we know to be absolutely true that *haqq* is the same as the 'things'. Whereas the 'things'

are limited and He is not. But the quantity of the different limitations is to show you the unlimitability and their unity.

Hence, *ḥaqq* is limited by the limitations of all the limiteds. A thing does not become limited except it is limited to limit the *ḥaqq*, because *ḥaqq* is manifested to limit all things and is the same as that thing. Thereby, the limitation of everything becomes the limitation of the *ḥaqq*. And the *ḥaqq* became limited by the limitation of all things. Hence, *ḥaqq* is contagious in all of the forms which are called *makhlūqât* (creatures) and *mubdi'ât* (derived from the Divine Name *badī'*, *badī' as-samawâti wa-l arḍ*, the beautiful scientific constructor of heaven and earth, that is equally, the beautiful scientifically constructed things). That is to say, *ḥaqq* is contagious in all the *ḥaqâ'iq* that are ephemeral with time, which are the creatures (*makhlūqât*), and all the Truth which is not ephemeral with time is *mubdi'ât*. That is to say, *ḥaqq* is in a state of contagion of being, in the '*âlam-i-khalq* (Universe of Creation), '*âlam-i-amr* (Universe of Orders), '*âlam-i-shahâdah* (Universe of Witnessing), '*âlam-i-arwâḥ* (Universe of Spirits), '*âlam-i-'ulwî* (the High Universes), '*âlam-i-sufî* (the Lowest Universes), and if the *amr* were not like this, existence would not have been real and there would have been nothing that existed, because the existences of the possible by itself is non-existence, (possibility cannot exist by its own existence). In fact, *ḥaqq* is the same as the existence of that which is by being manifest as that form, and preserves all things from ever non-existing by being the same as that thing, and preserves by Its own Ipseity, which includes all things, and the preservation of all things is not a weight on *ḥaqq* and does not fatigue It, because by being the same as all things, It is not a weight on Itself. That is to say, as the images of existent things are the images of the *ḥaqq*, through Its Names, which means that the total of things preserved by *ḥaqq* is not other than the presence of the image of *ḥaqq* Itself, which means the presence of all things is the presence of Its own image, which means that all things are His own image. Because if all things were not His image and if *ḥaqq* had not preserved them, then there would be things, and It would have a partner in existence (*shirk*), and as that possibility cannot exist by its own existence, in no other way could things have existence, other than by the *ḥaqq*'s existence and by the preservation of Its own Self, which would have necessitated two faces in manifest existence. Therefore, *ḥaqq* is manifest and witnessed through all things in manifestation in the universes, because there is no other than It in existence. Therefore, the universe is the image and

manifestation of *ḥaqq*, and *ḥaqq* is the spirit and interior of the universe, and the universe is the *insân-i-kabîr* (Big Man) by virtue of its being the image, because that image is the image of *ḥaqq* according to the image of *rahmân* according to His image created, and thereby it is *ẓâhir* because *ḥaqq* is *ẓâhir* in the universe, because that universe is the image of *ḥaqq*. And that which is *bâtin* is also *ḥaqq* because He is both *ẓâhir* and *bâtin*. Hence *ḥaqq* is the total of the immanence. That is to say, the *ẓâhir* and *bâtin* of immanence is *ḥaqq*, ('Indeed the immanence is an illusion, and it is the Truth in Truth'), and *ḥaqq* is that Single Existent which is that which maintains my existence because it is through His existence that it exists.

This way, *ḥaqq* is Itself and is other than Itself, but by being other than Itself, It is not other than Itself, because other is Itself again; thereby, there is no other than *ḥaqq*.

Now, let it be known thus, that *nafs-i-rahmânî* in the *bâtin* of the *ta'ayyun awwal* in the degree of 'ama, is matter and *hayûlâ* to all the images of creatural possibility and images of Divine knowledges of the *ghayb*, and all the images of the Names; in the same way, the *nafs insânî* is *hayûlâ* to all images of letters and words. That is to say, the *nafs insânî*, though the same as the person itself in the interior of the human heart, is individuated in the *bâtin* of the human heart, and passing through where the letters originate from, is individuated in each degree, and passing through each degree is in a different individuation until it reaches the degree of the letter *waw* and manifests through the last of the letter sources which is the degree of the letter *waw*, which is all-inclusive of all the special qualities of all the letters; in the same way as the *nafs-i-rahmânî*, while it was still the same as the *la ta'ayyun* and in the interior of the *ta'ayyun awwal*, became individuated in that *ta'ayyun awwal*, and the totality of the letters of the unknown and the Divine Names and realities and the images of the immanence, became individuated. And in each degree, the *nafs-ar-rahmân* became individuated in that degree. Then as that *nafs-ar-rahmân* progressed and manifested through the degrees both Divine and immanent, thereby the unknown letters and Divine words and Truth and images of immanence became individuated in it. And in each degree, the *nafs-ar-rahmân* became individuated with that degree, just as every degree became individuated in the *nafs-ar-rahmân*, and hence, when it reached the last degree of all the degrees of existence, which is the degree of *insân-i-kâmil*, which includes all the Divine and immanent degrees, the *nafs-ar-rahmân*

became individuated in all the Divine and immanent degrees, containing and including all the qualities of the unknown letters and Divine words and the letters of existence and the words, and the images of immanence. Hence, the *nafs-ar-raḥmân* is matter and *hayûlâ* to the totality of the images of the relationships of the Divine Lordship and the images of creatural possibility. All the images, while they are in It in potentiality, are there in manifestation and It is individuated in all the images, but the rulership of the relationship of images of qualities of Names is dependent upon the realization and existence in manifestation of the images of possibilities. In the *nafs-ar-raḥmân* and the witnessable *tajalli* of the *subhân*, all the Divine and manifest images became manifest by being manifest in the images of immanence which is the place of manifestation of their determinations and actions and the place of their effects of Lordship, because of their Divine relationship which is the rulership of the Divine Names. Therefore, for the universe, the Divine relationship becomes true through the relationship of the Divinity (*ilâh*) of the 'Divinifier' (*mu'allih*) with the 'divinified' (*ma'lûh*); and the relationship of the Lord (*rabb*) to the servant (*marbûb*), and also for the universe, the Divine relationship becomes truth by the manifestation and individuation of the image of *nafs-ar-raḥmân* and the *tajalli* of existence, because the images of the universe, in respect of this relationship to their own *nafs*, are in non-existence, but are existent only through the existence of the *ḥaqq*. But the rulership of the relationship of the images of the Names is dependent upon the existence and manifestation and realization of the images of the possibilities.

This is according to what the Prophet explained of what God told him: 'On the Last Day of Judgement, I shall remove from you your relationship to your own *nafs* and I shall return you to your original relationship which is your relationship to Me.' At which point an '*abd*' is not described according to his own *nafs*, but is described by his *rabb*, because an '*abd*' is not an '*abd*' by the quality of his own *nafs*, but by the quality of his *rabb*. That is why people are called '*abd-ar-raḥmân*', etc.; because the *rabbness* of *rabb-al-'âlamîn* is only realizable through the *marbûbness* of the universes; and the *khâliqness* of the *khâliq* is only realizable by the *khalqness* of the *makhlûq*. And the *rabb* and the '*abd*' are each to the other *maḥmûd*, (from *ḥamd*, rendered grace to, recipient of grace), and Protector and the *madhmûm* (Abject); because there is an intimate relationship between the '*abd*', which is recipient of the manifestation of individuation of the thatness of existence which is no

other than the existence of the *ḥaqq*, which in turn is no other than all these acts, qualities and graces. Hence, if the actions and bad results are attributed to the '*abd*', the '*abd*' becomes the protector of his Lord from the attribution of these badnesses; because badnesses and faults are within the laws of non-existence, and the recipient of them is the '*abd*'. On the other hand, if the nice things and perfections and graces are attributed to the Lord (*ḥaqq*), the *ḥaqq* then becomes the protector of the '*abd*' by not validating the attribution of such things to the '*abd*', which is not in its essence, because He is the essence of the '*abd*', because graces and perfections are of existence and are for the existence of *ḥaqq*, and even further, they are the Reality of the Reality. Therefore, the highest degree of relating to the Reality is for the '*abd*' to make the Lord his Protector, and it is to draw attention to this that he said: 'Those who have related to the Reality have made God the Protector in their ipseity, in their quality and in their actions, and covered their own ipseity with the Ipseity of the *ḥaqq* and their qualities with the Qualities of *ḥaqq* and their actions with the actions of *ḥaqq*. Thereby the *ḥaqq* covers their *ẓāhir*.' That is to say, it has become exactly the same as the image they manifest, their ipseity and 'I'-ness having found *fanā*' in the existence of Reality.

And these people have no manifest existence except that their place of abode is non-place of abode, that is to say, their place of abode is Reality. Therefore, the man who does that which he does for payment of his deeds is never equal to the man who does it out of his own will (since it is not imposed), and his prayers are not because they are imposed, but because he wants to show '*abdness*' to the *rabb* and establish the *rabb*, and so *rabb* can establish the '*abd*', not because he wants to gain anything by it but looks at it from the point of view of giving and receiving of pleasure. Whereas, the man who acts and is ignorant, like he who prays so that he reaches paradise and is preserved from fire, he is not like this, and when he is in action, his action is in witnessing his own *rabb*. If in one way the *ḥaqq* is the protector of the '*abd*', in the same way the '*abd*' is the protector of the *ḥaqq*. Because, though the *ḥaqq* is protecting the '*abd*', preserving him in the *kamālāt* (degrees of completion), in the same way the '*abd*' is protecting the *ḥaqq* from being tainted by lacks and ill things. But whatever is true, both from the point of view of *bāṭin* and *ẓāhir*, He is both *ḥaqq* and *khalq* and contains both perfection and lack: or equally, one can say He is not in every way *ḥaqq*, because in one way He is *khalq*. If it were not so, there would not

be a succession of envoys, each different, because at each moment, as shown by what God says about the Last Day of Judgement: 'I will appear to them in the way they believed I was', and in the Quran it says: 'Do you see those who think they know their Lord and prostrate themselves to it . . .' In short, our existence and persistence is with Him, and our heart and forehead are in His Hand and we are in His power and expenditure, and in whatever way He is, we are that, and whether in *fanâ* or *baqâ*, we are at His level present and we are not separate from Him and He is not separate from us.

Therefore, the ignorant denies Him because He appears in every form, but the one who knows recognizes Him in every image and the '*ârif*' knows Him as transcendent beyond the images because *haqq* is in every moment in a different configuration and for Him there is no established figure; and the religious man makes Him transcendent according to his religion. And when they describe Him without body, height or width, this is the transcending of the ignorant transcender. Whereas the one qualifies Him with the qualities common to him and to God, the observing '*ârif*' qualifies Him with all the qualities. If someone sees the *haqq* from *haqq* in *haqq* and the same as *haqq*, that is to say, if he saw it as the Absolute *haqq*, when he saw Him in manifestation as in the Being of *haqq*, as the Reality of *haqq*, which is to say as the *aḥadiyyah*, which is the same as saying the *aḥadiyyah* of plurality, that man knows God. But if a man sees *haqq* from *haqq* in *haqq* through his own eyes or *nafs*, that man is not an '*ârif*', because the '*ârif*' knows that no other eye but the eye of the *haqq* can see the *haqq*. But he also is not ignorant of that which sees *haqq* from *haqq* in *haqq*, but he is not a complete '*ârif*'. But if a man does not see *haqq* from *haqq* and also in *haqq* and expects to see the *haqq* in the other world with his eye, that man is ignorant. And if a man does not see *haqq* from *haqq* in *haqq* but expects to see the *haqq* in the other world through the eye of *haqq*, he is from the relative ignorance; he knows it is not visible except through the eye of *haqq* because he is ignorant and veiled. And in general, therefore, every person has a belief special to him about his *haqq*, and without doubt, that person will return to his Lord according to his private belief. And if the *haqq* appears to the man who has a private belief, according to his belief, he establishes the *haqq* in that belief and that person knows the *haqq*, and if He appears to him in another form, not according to his belief, then he denies and takes refuge in his own Lord and thinks he has escaped from being misled. Hence, there is not one person of

any form or belief who does not establish God according to his imagination and *wahm*. Therefore, this God is an erroneous, 'brought-about' God.

Now, let it be known like this, that God is far removed from being imagined in one form of manifestation (*tajalli*), from one condition and from one individuation, because He is, by nature of Absoluteness and *la ta'ayyun* and Ipseity, far removed, and because there is an eternity and indefinity and infinity of manifestations. Hence the people of *kashf* and *shuhûd* and gnosis and existence, whose hearts are clear of mental imaginings and dogmas and *awhâm*, can never, and will never, determine God to one image or dogma, and believe in that; but they see Him in all the varied manifestations according to the manifestation of the Name who is the *rabb* of that manifestation, knowing it has manifested in that manifestation according to the inclination of that manifestation or place, etc. Therefore, they do not acknowledge Him in one manifestation and deny Him in the opposite manifestation. And they observe Him in manifestation in that moment according to the Name that necessitates it, because they do not limit Him to any manifestation anywhere, ever. Because manifestation is infinite, indefinite, and every moment is different and unlimited. But the people who believe in religious dogmas, deny one another's religion; what they have conjectured in their *nafs* they take for God and they only see their own *nafs* because of its mental image, and because of this, what they imagine is the same as their own *nafs*, because their mentality has brought about this image in *nafs* from *nafs* by *nafs*, and then that which they have seen in their *nafs* becomes their Lord. Therefore, the people who are veiled through being attached, careful, who go through one form of dogma, what they see as God is their *nafs* and there is no difference between idols and such brought-about Gods.

But in the end, even that is also He, because in their mind there are the *asmâ'* which they imagine to be God, and He appears to them in those *asmâ'* and He is also God, as there is nothing else anyhow. Therefore, what they see is the *rabb* of a Name which is their private *rabb* and it is not the Absolute *rabb*, but equally, at the same time, it is not another *rabb*. Therefore, if the '*ârif* sees and observes with all his capacities etc., completely, he observes *haqq*, (but nobody can observe *haqq* but *haqq*); therefore look at the different degrees of mankind in the knowledge of God. Therefore, anybody who believes in the dogmatic belief of his own predilection to the exclusion of other beliefs is a man

who denies the manifestation of God in other realities. As there is no other thing but His manifestation in every thing that is manifested, He is manifested, and if you deny Him in any of manifestation, then you deny His Absoluteness.

With the amount of things you deny, equally so much of His *khayran kathîra* is diminished from you. 'He gives wisdom to whom He likes, and when He has given wisdom, great good is established' (*khayran kathîra*). And by denying and covering over (*kufr*) Truth, he is *mahrûm* (missed out, disinherited, unapportioned), alienated from the Reality of all the manifestations and Knowledge of God, which is Absoluteness and permeates all beliefs and is not monopolized in any of them, and he dies away from Him because he makes the Reality private to his own belief and denies it of other beliefs, and he becomes ignorant of Reality and a denier, except in one single limited way.

Therefore, you must become the *hayûlâ* for the totality of images of belief in your *nafs*, so that all the totality of images become manifested in you, and this is the only way to approach absolute manifestation, and if you cannot do this, it is difficult to reach Union with the Absolute because you miss out the first step. However, also remember that though the Truth, *haqq*, cannot be limited to one manifestation of Truth, It cannot be limited equally to the totality of manifestation of beliefs, because *haqq* is even larger, more permeating and more unknowable than that. The result is that what is told the '*ârif*', is exactly as God has said: 'Wherever you look, you see the face of God existent', and not defining it in any way, it is always Him and His Ipseity. He meant that when you look at the things of the world, go on seeing His Ipseity and do not for a moment be unaware of His Ipseity. Yet there are times of delusion while you are busy with the things of this world, which means at the moment of non-seeing the Reality and the non-awareness of the Ipseity in your heart, you can be taken away, die in that moment. And the person who dies in that moment is not the same as the one who dies in constant awareness. One was killed while unaware of the Ipseity, and the other while aware of the Ipseity and equally, he shall be resurrected in a different situation. Therefore, it is necessary, in every moment of wakefulness and/or vision, one must be facing Him, until in one's heart, there is the quietude of one's awareness that, whatever one does, consciously or not, all will be directed to Him, and that is how they should die.

Therefore, having seen all this, everyone having a belief is also in the Reality because even in that limited reality there is Him.

Of the Wisdom of Opening
(*al-ḥikmat al-futūḥiyyah*)
in the Word of Salih

Of all the marvellous Acts is the Act of mounts (*āyat-ul-rakâ'ib*)

And thus is the variety in the ways;

**From among them there are those who there abide in
Truth**

**And of them there are those who cut distances into deserts
of wilderness;**

But those who abide are people of '*ayn*,

And the cutters of distances are the masses and followers;

And to all He gives from that which is

The opening of His *ghayb* from every side.

Of all the marvellous Acts is the Act of mounts

So that you endeavour to reach your goal, the Act of mounts is one of the Divine Acts which shows itself as specialized in the case of each envoy, like the she-camel for Salih and the *burâq* for Mohammed. Here the Shēykh started the chapter with reference to the mount because, in the case of Salih, the she-camel plays a most important part in the confirmation of the veracity of his calling people to the Truth, and the word 'mount' is the plural of the word '*rakiba*', and the *rakiba* is the thing one gets onto to arrive at where one is intending to go. This is like a symbol of the *himmah* and acts of the prophets and saints and their people and followers, by which they are brought to the original aim which is completion. Of these, each one is particular to one kind of mount: some of them are on the mount of *himmah*, some of them are on the mount of works (*a'mâl*) etc., and each one is on a different road because the roads to God are the same as the number of the selves of the creatures. Each one has his own particular gait and his own particular road, and due to the particularity of the road he has the suitable mount, and the difference of the particularities of the roads is due to the necessities of the Name of the particular Lordship, and the

particular Name of the Lordship is according to their specialization which is to their original, essential inclination.

And thus is the variety in the ways

That is to say, as we have seen, *himmah* and works which are the mounts, which are of the Divine Acts, are different due to the different ways, and that each one has a different way is due to the difference in these Lords which are in possession of their foreheads, and their particularities and differences, as we have said, are due to the differences in the essential inclinations. The reason for the variety and numerousness of the mounts which are no other than the *himmah* and the works is due to the differences and varieties in the ways. In the same manner, since these mounts are different acts by virtue of different ways, and since it is by them that distances are cut, they are the things that guide you to where you should arrive, which is the original intention. Equally, what is intended by mounts is the bodily image which is the image of the animal *nafs*, whereas those who are mounted on them are the 'speaking *nafs*' which are the completed human spirits, because the human *nafs* does not reach the level of perfection except with the image of the body which is his mount. The bodily image does not move except through the power of God, and the reason why there is difference in the travelling to God is due to the mounts which are Divine actions by virtue of the travellers' particular tastes.

**From among them there are those who there abide in
Truth**

There is a group from among those who are cutting distances with the acts of mounts, who abide on the way with the acts of mounts and on the journey to God, with the acts of God and with the reality of abiding. They do not abide with the reality of abiding unless they have passed beyond (*fani*) their own beings and are subsistent (*bâqi*) with the Truth; therefore, at the level of witnessing unity they abide with the acts of God and the reality of abiding, and there the *haqq* becomes the same as their ipseities, their strengths, their images, their way, their mounts and their beliefs, and then their travelling becomes travelling to God.

**And of them there are those who cut distances into deserts
of wilderness**

Which means that they never arrive anywhere and never reach the

intention and remain short, and these do not abide with the reality of abiding with the acts of God which are the mounts. They have according to their own sights and intelligence spent the acts and deviated. The Shaykh, may God be pleased with him, has differentiated these two categories by saying:

But those who abide are people of 'ayn

That is, those who are in the reality of abiding in the way of the Truth with the mounts which are the acts of Truth, those who abide thus are people of 'ayn and they are people of sight and witnessing (*shuhūd*), and they invite the people to God with vision (*baṣīrah*) and are faithful (*ṣādiq*) in their invitation, and these are the people of 'ayn and these are aimers at the Essence (*maqṣūd bidhāt*), and the intention of all aimers is for these people.

And the cutters of distances are the masses and followers

Veiled from the Reality of Knowledge, full of *wahm* and of intelligences overcoloured by *wahm*, these cutters are the populace and subjects who get invited to the Truth and they are used like animals in wars and equally in affairs of religion and the world. They are the populace and the subjects. The word used, '*janā'ib*', is the plural of '*janiba*' which is derived as a conjugation from the word '*janūb*' which means 'south' but which equally means 'south' because of farness, and thereby these are distanced from Reality.

And to all He gives from that which is

The opening of His Unknowable (*ghayb*) from every side.

All abiders and the cutters receive the opening of the Unknowable from every side from God; the opening of the unknowableness from God which is specific to them comes from God, from the unknowableness of the Essence and from the unknowableness of the Name of the private Lord which is his divinity and also which is in the unknowableness of the knowledge of God concerning him and which is in the unknowableness of the fixed potentialities (*al 'ayn-al-thābita*). And this arrives from every side to him. In another sense they receive what they deserve according to the unknowableness of their essence, but the opening of the first category of people who are abiding with the Truth, for them this world and the other world are necessarily inherent (*mulāzima*). And God gives them their desert with the opening (*futūh*) which is lenient

to their *nafs*, even though in this world which is the world of calamity, and in certain orders (*amr*) of the images of tests through which God deals with them, it sometimes appears in the exterior (*zâhir*) as if it were not lenient, but their end-products and fruits are always lenient; so whichever way it appears, their desert is lenient. The opening of the second group, those who cut into the desert, if they agree to what they are invited to and in all their actions, qualities and characters agree to what they are invited to, then the gate of desert will be opened to them in a manner which is lenient according to their nature. But if they receive what they are invited to without agreement, and object to it with covering and revolt and antagonism and disruption, then the gates of desert will be open to them in a manner which is not lenient to them. This wisdom which the Shaykh has just pronounced as the Wisdom of Opening is the very first revelation of the Mystery of Opening (*futûih*). Therefore he explains.

Know it like this, may the High God make you successful, that the order of coming into being, in the *Nafs* and in the Ipseity (*dhât*), is built upon singularity. Singularity belongs to the realm of numbers, like one person is part of a couple. But if the beginning of numbers which is 'one' is not numbered in trinity there cannot be singularity; therefore for singularity trinity is the result. Equally, singularity is resultant from trinity and equally from a larger number than the trinity, but its first degree is trinity. Consequently, trinity is the first of singularity, which means the beginning of singularity is trinity. Trinity is not second and not below singularity. This is from the Divine Presence where singularity tacitly comprises trinity (*mutaḍâmin*—united in intrinsic solidarity). The universe became existent because if the Divine Ipseity had not become revealed (*muta'ayyin*) by Will and Speech, It could not have become and becoming could not have emanated from It, because by virtue of uniqueness nothing can emanate from the Ipseity of God. Therefore, of these, that is to say, of the Ipseity, of the Will and of the Speech, if any one of these were missing, the being of the universe could not have happened. And God said: 'In fact when We will for something to be, We say to it "Be" (*kun*) and at the level of the emanation of the Word "Be" from Us that thing is existent', and this Ipseity is the Ipseity of Will and Speech, and it is not that there is Ipseity *and* Its Will and Speech. The Divine Presence, which is revealed (*muta'ayyin*) in the Presence of Singularity, is the creative Ipseity of Will and Speech. If this creative Ipseity were not there together with Its Will, and here

Will means the relationship of the Ipseity of God's facing (*tawajjuh*) specifically to the immanencing of an order, and in addition to this, at the level of *haqq* facing that thing there was not His Word 'Be', that thing would not have been. In short, at the level of the Ipseity of creativity and Its connection with Will and His Word 'Be', that which exists at the level of the Reality of these could not have existence. Consequently, a trinity results from there being Ipseity, Will and Speech, and in this trinity singularity appears and the universes come into existence from this singularity; in other words, directly trinity of singularity is established for the 'Ipseity of the bringer into existence', a triple singularity manifests in that which is the receptor. Because of singularity which manifests in the thing which is the receptor, that thing's immanencing itself and its qualification by existence becomes a reality. In other words, the immanencing of a thing is by its own *nafs* which is a triune singularity, because if there had not been this receptive singularity there could have been no effect for the Divine Singularity and perhaps not an establishment of singularity, because for the *haqq* the establishment of singularity depends on the singularity of the thing, and the singularity of a thing is nothing other than that thing's thingness which is established in the Divine Knowledge and is its hearing; which means its hearing of the Divine Word.

And also, the bringing into existence of its own existence is the concordance of the immanence to the order which it is given. Consequently, from the point of view of the receptive thing, that which causes its coming into being is its singularity; and from the point of view of the bringer into existence, what is necessary is the singularity of that bringer into existence. Consequently, the three on one side becomes equivalent to the three on the other. The ipseity of the thing which is established in the Divine Knowledge at the time of non-existence becomes balanced by the Ipseity of the *haqq* which is its bringer into existence, and that thing's hearing the Word 'Be' is balanced by the Will of the *haqq* which is its bringer into existence, and that thing's concordance to the reception of that order which was ordered to it prior to its immanence is balanced by the Word 'Be' of the *haqq*. Consequently, that receptive thing is existent by concordance to the order of the bringer into existence. And the High *haqq*, by saying: '... and they become', relates or ties the immanence to the thing; in other words, at the level of the emanation of the order the thing becomes immanent through its own *nafs*. If at the level of the Word '*kun*', which

is the order, there had not been in the strength of the thing the inherency to become immanent through its own *nafs*, that thing could not have been immanenced. One must understand that this thing which is non-existent did not get invented at the level of the emanation of the order to be immanenced, but, on the contrary, that thing's bringing itself into being was already established in the Divine Knowledge and in the Name *bâtin* when the Divine order happened and it was manifested at that level. Whatever thing is in the Unknowableness and is established in the Divine Knowledge, in that thing's strength exists manifestation, because the ipseity of the Name Interior (*bâtin*) is exactly the same as the ipseity of the Name Manifest (*zâhir*). Equally, the receiver of action is exactly the same as the actor, and for *haqq* there has always been established two Hands: with one Hand He is the Actor and Inventor, with the other He is the Receiver. Action is for the actor, and reception is for the receptor. Now the thing which is established in the Divine Knowledge but which is non-existent in the vision of the eye, its immanence is at the level of the emanation of the order and the application of the Will to it. If in the Divine Knowledge that thing were not established and did not have its thingness and could not hear the Word '*kun*' and had no inclination for immanence and had no receptivity to receiving and had no ability to concord with the order, that thing would not have been immanenced. That is to say, that thing is brought into being by its own *nafs* but is brought into being with the Reality in the Reality. And the High God establishes this factor with the word: '. . . and it becomes' (*fayakun*), which means that the thing's immanence is indeed established already by that thing's *nafs* and it is not established for the *haqq*; but that thing which is established in the immanence of a thing is specifically and only the order (*amr*) of the *haqq* and nothing else. The High God gave this news from His own *nafs*: 'When We will that a thing becomes, We order to that thing and say "Be" and it becomes.' Consequently, God Himself attributes the immanencing which results from the order (*amr*) of God, to the *nafs* of the thing, because after having said the order 'Be' He added: '. . . and it becomes', and who else is more truthful (*şâdiq*) than God in His word?

When the immanence is attributed to the *nafs* it seems that the order spoken hears in itself the immanence. However, the reality is that that which hears the immanence is the thing which receives the order, and appearance happens due to the nature of the receptor, and there is no

part appertaining to the order given in this except by the giving of the order. The Shaykh gives an example here: there is a master against whom rebellion does not come into consideration, and this master orders his servant to rise. The servant arises in concordance with this order; in the rising of the servant there is no part appertaining to the master except in the word, the order. The action of rising remains completely with the servant. In this case arising is attributable to the master only in so far as the order of rising has emanated from him, and because of this order the act of arising has happened in the servant.

That which is established in the Divine Knowledge but which is non-existent in the vision of the eye, is the thing which exists with the Knowledge of Existence, and it is never non-existent with total non-existence. Its immanencing at the level of the emanation of the Divine order is its manifestation exemplifying the Divine order according to that image of knowledge. Consequently, that thing's manifestation according to that image mentioned above cannot be attributed to the *ḥaqq*. Its manifestation is from the side of the thing; from the side of the *ḥaqq* it is only the order to manifest, and if the order does not come at that level that thing remains all the same according to its establishment in the Divine Knowledge. For the emanation of the action (*fi'l*), the actor (*fā'il*) is no other than the receiver of the order (*ma'mūr*) who is acted upon (*munfa'il*) by the order (*amr*). In this way there is absolute establishment of fact that for the thing which appears according to the image in the Knowledge, if there are faults and errors in its action of appearance, these cannot be attributed to the *ḥaqq* which gave the order, but to itself. (For example, if the servant obeying the order of the master to stand up does so too quickly, he may find himself dizzy upon standing up. This fault in standing up and stumbling can in no way be attributed to the order to stand up, since both the action of standing up in accordance with the order and the errors committed in the execution of the order belong entirely to the receptor of the order, that is, to the servant; and the order itself and the giver of the order are entirely without blame.)

Inmanence then is essentially existent according to trinity. That is from either side, the side of *ḥaqq* and the side of the *khalq*, thingness (*shay'iyah*), hearing and accordance. From the side of the *ḥaqq* there is the Ipseity and the Will and the Word. From the side of the *khalq* there is the Thingness, the Hearing and Accordance. In fact for the occurrence of immanence there has to be established a trinity from

either side. If one of the elements which are inherent to the two triunities is missing, no immanence is possible. That is to say, after the immanence has been established, the trinity of the guides (*dalil*—guide, something which leads you to a point of vision) became fluent in the bringing about of meanings. But the guide can be no other than composed of three which is according to the special organization (*nizâm*) or according to the special condition or even according to the special image, and under these conditions the guide in its priority results in the resultant and certainly cannot be other than according to the composition of the special arrangement of things. If the guide is by association, it would have been composed of the limits of trinity, of which one would be the smaller, one would be the bigger and the third would be the middle limit; but if the guide is exceptional, then it would be composed of being prior and being subsequent and by position or elevation. And the special arrangement is this: the proofs of the people of vision who are overseeing the guides compose their guide from two priorities, one of which is the small and one of which is the big, so that each priority will contain two singulars; consequently the singulars become four, and of these four one singular becomes repeated in its priority, and that one is the middle limit in that one of the priorities becomes connected to the subsequentity exactly like betrothal which attaches the two couples together, or like in the religious marriage which consists of the husband, the wife and the witness who, without a doubt, is tied to both sides exactly like the middle limit. Consequently, singular becomes three and cannot be anything other because in its priority one singular is repetitious; consequently the guides and the meanings in their coming into being result from trinity. Hence that which is desired from its priority results.

This arrangement comes about according to the special face, and that special face is the tying of one of its priorities to the subsequent, and that singular face is what verifies trinity by reason of its repetition. And the special face is therefore the repetition of the subsequent, and the special condition in this composition is that the determination (*hukm*) is non-specific and defective. In short, when the guide is composed according to the special arrangement and special condition, the determination (*hukm*) is truthful (*ṣâdiq*), and what is desired from the determination is the thing which is determined, and this is exactly how the great Totality is, and what was meant by defect was the middle limit because, in the result, the middle limit is the defect of the

determination. The example of the fact that the determination is general is: man is animal, all animals are body (*jism*), man is body. Body (*jism*) is determination but in this respect it is defective and non-specific because each body is not animal. And the example that the order is equal is: man is animal, all animals have feelings and man has feelings. In this case feelings is equal to animal. The middle limit is called 'defective' because it takes on the image of defect for the sake of comparison. Perhaps it is even that it is a defect in the happening of the result, because had there not been the middle limit there could not have happened to be a result between the two priorities, and if it were not non-specific and defective and if it were not equal, then the order would result with an untrue result. For example: man is animal and some of the animals are horses; consequently to say that all men are horses would be untrue, and the truthfulness of the order depends entirely on the composition being according to the special condition, and its not being true is entirely dependent on the result not being according to the special condition. But then the arrival at the untrue result or lack of truth of the result is existent in the universe, like the attribution of actions to the servant, though they were devoid of any quality of attribution to God. That is to say, if the action is attributed to the servant who is its actor, by an order (*amr*) from God, or by the emanation of its existence, that act is all the while devoid of any quality of attributability to God. Therefore the result becomes untrue because the servant is a receptor and the receptor has no existence of itself; consequently, for the result to happen it is not sufficient to have the *nafs* of the receptor, because if a thing is not existent by its own *nafs* and exists because of something else, how can it bring into existence any other thing? Therefore it is definitely from the actor, and the actor in reality is the *haqq*, and the servant exists by the existence of the *haqq* and is dispenser by His strength. Therefore the servant who is receptor becomes actor by the existence of *haqq*. Therefore to ignore the existence of *haqq* in the servant and to attribute the action to the servant is not true, and to attribute this immanence absolutely to God, that is to say, to attribute all the actions absolutely to God in spite of the fact that they emanate from the servant himself, is not true, because it is unimaginable that an action take place without the receptor; consequently action cannot be attributed absolutely to God. Of these two attributions each one is absolute lie because in reality the *amr* of immanence is from God but the immanence is from the servant.

However, the great *ḥaqq* qualified the immanence with one thing which is that from the side of *ḥaqq* it was told to be, which means that God, *ḥaqq*, attributed the immanence to the thing through its accordance with the Divine order; consequently to become immanent is the Divine order, and to become immanent and be in accordance with that *amr* is from the thing. According to the special arrangement (*nizâm*) and special condition, the result is true like the example of the guide which is composed of three. For example, if we wished to bring about a guide to show that the existence of the universe is according to a cause, we would say: 'For everything that is subsequent there must be a cause' (*kullu ḥadīth falahu sabab*), and this is known as the great priority (*muqadimmah*), which means there exists for each subsequent a cause, which means that we take and keep from the priority the words 'subsequent' and 'cause' and after that in the latter priority which is the smaller priority we say: 'The universe is subsequent.' Consequently, in the two priorities we see the word 'subsequent' is repeated, and the singular third which is the small limit is our word 'the universe' with which in the two priorities trinity results. Consequently, the guide has resulted in the saying: 'For the universe there is a cause.' Consequently, in one priority which is the greater priority that which was mentioned there became apparent in the result, and that thing which was mentioned there is cause. In other words, the cause became apparent in the result. And as in the priority the determination (*ḥukm*) was by it, equally in the result it is with the same determination; that is why it was said: 'It has a cause.' In our argument that 'the existence of the universe is due to a cause', what the guide dictates is this way: the arrangement is that all subsequents have a cause; the universe is subsequent (therefore) the universe has a cause (*kullu ḥadīth falahu sabab wal-'ālam ḥadīth, fal-'ālam lahu sabab*). This form is the fourth form wherein the middle limit is carried in the greater and posed in the smaller and returned to the first form. Then we say: 'The universe is subsequent and all the subsequents have a cause' and this results in the saying: 'The universe has a cause.' Consequently, the cause which was mentioned in the priority has appeared in the result.

Now in the example just mentioned the special face is the repetition of the word 'subsequent' which is the middle limit. And the 'special condition' is the generality or non-particularity of the defect, which means that the defect and the cause of the existent is non-particular or general because each thing which is subsequent in its existence needs a

defect and a cause. And what is meant by the generality of defect is the generality of defect in the exterior which is the thing which causes the universe to be subsequent, which in the example just given was determined with it, and became the same as the determination (*ḥukm*), and that is our word 'has a cause'. In the proof the middle limit which is defect is also subsequent and not what is desired, because in the proof the defect is the defect of the determination and not the defect of the existent. In short, what is desired is the defect of the existent with which the determination is to be made, and then that is the same as the determination, because the defect which causes the subsequent to exist in the exterior is the cause and the cause in non-particularity is from God in the case of the coming into subsequence of the universe, and that it is not particular (specific) is due to the fact that the cause is attributable to the subsequent, because cause refers to *ḥaqq*, because the *ḥaqq* by the Word 'Be' ordered the immanencing of the reality of the universe. Therefore it equally refers to the universe because at the level of hearing the order and being in agreement with it by its inclination from when it was in the *ghayb*, the universe becomes immanenced.

(The Shaykh, may God be pleased with him, in chapter 182 of his *Futūḥāt* says: '*Wa lama lam yaṣīḥḥ al-wujūd anna wujūd al-'ālam illa bil-qawl min Allāh wa as-samā' min al-'ālam yaẓhar wujūd ṭuruq as-su'ādah wa 'ilm al-farq baynahumma wa bayn ṭuruq ash-shifā' illa bil-qawl al-ilāhi wa samā' al-kawni*', and this cause is spiritual.)

And the cause refers equally to the cause of creation like it is attributed to this creature's existence, a creature's existence which is already a creature prior to it, either by attribution of action or by special attribution, and this cause exists in all totality of existents aside from the Prime Intellect. Subsequentiation is special to the universe in the exterior, and subsequentiation equally by its relationship to the totality of subsequents is general but the cause is even more general than that. Under this consideration, in the words: 'In the subsequential appearance of the universe' (*fi ḥudūth ul-'ālam*) there is the meaning: 'There are ways' (*fi ṭuruq*) and if the cause is attributable to the thing which needs a cause it becomes more non-specific or general than that which is subsequent. And if this is taken into consideration it means that the subsequentiality of the universe, the establishment of the cause of the coming into subsequence of the universe from God, is more general because that thing for which there is resultant a cause is more

general than the universe and therefore more general than the subsequent emanation of the universe from God because the Divine Names and the qualifications of Lordship are not from the universe. But these are dependent upon the *ḥuḳm al-aqdas* and the *naḥs-i-raḥmāni-wa-'ama'i* to be realized in the Divine Presence. By saying: 'It has a cause', I mean the determination (*ḥuḳm*) because it is a *ḥuḳm* for the universe by virtue of the establishment of a cause. And as in the subsequent the defect of subsequence and its cause is non-specific and general, in the same way in this example the determination and cause here also becomes general, and what is meant from the words 'the generality of defect' with the cause which is general in the exterior, the determination (*ḥuḳm*) is equally general here.

In fact as above he said: 'The special condition is that the *ḥuḳm* is non-specific of defect or equal to it' (*wa shartu-l mahṣūs an yakūn al-ḥuḳm amma min al-'illah aw musāwīyan lahā*); consequently, the *ḥuḳm* which is the cause is more general than the defect of the cause which is subsequent, and this comparison becomes the great Total and its result is true. The cause of determination is in the proof and it is the middle limit. We determine for each subsequent that in reality there is established a cause by saying: 'It is due to a cause', and this is equilateral whether it is in the proof where the cause is the middle limit, where in our example our word 'subsequent' is equal to the determination, or whether we have in the example meant the subsequent because of the subsequencing of the Ipseity from the subsequent, as the subsequent thing of the Ipseity is equal to the subsequent for that thing which has a cause, or whether the determination is more general than that or whether we meant by the subsequent the temporal subsequence: whichever way, the subsequent is included beneath or underneath the determination of the cause, and the result becomes true, because the great Total which is the condition of comparison exists in it. That which is mentioned, that is the determination of trinity, has really manifested in the bringing into existence of those meanings which are obtained through the guides, exactly as, in the existence of the general, trinity has manifested. It becomes manifest from the above-mentioned priorities that the origin of *kawn* (immanence) is trinity, both from the side of the *ḥaqq* and from the side of the immanence. And the words: 'The origin of immanence is trinity' becomes: 'The origin of immanencing was established in the trinity'; and in this situation it becomes like a result for the priorities which have been arranged.

Because the origin of immanence is trinity, God manifested this in the Wisdom of Salih, upon him be peace, through the fact that his people were to be delayed for three days as a promise which cannot be belied. In other words, in the destruction of the people of Salih, the High God delayed the destruction for three days, and when the three days were completed thus, His promise became veridic, and the wisdom in this is that the inclination to destroy comes about in three days and here the destruction resulted at the level of the trinity just as existence came about at the level of the trinity. Consequently, in the taking away of the people of Salih, may peace be on him, the wisdom in God's making the three days an indisputable promise is that His promise came about by virtue of the trinity in the words 'three days'. And the faithfulness of that result is that loud voice through which sound the *ḥaqq* destroyed them, so that they were destroyed in their houses with their chests to the earth and in this way they entered the morning and were unable to get up from where they were.

Consequently, as the inclination to destroy them was completed in three days, then trinity caused that sound which destroyed them. Of the three days, on the first day the faces of the people of Salih became extremely yellow, and on the second day they became extremely red, and on the third day they became extremely black; and when the three days were completed the propensity to become destroyed became a reality and from them became manifest the day of corruption and that manifestation was called destruction, and the reality of their destruction came about at the level of trinity among days. And the becoming yellow of the faces of these wretches became balanced by God's words spoken in reference to the happy ones whose faces glow, but in this case the word 'glow' (*musfirah*) is derived from '*sufûr*' and '*sufûr*' is '*zuhûr*' which means 'manifested'. Consequently, the yellowing became the symbol of wretchedness manifesting in the people of Salih. After this there was the reddening of the faces of the people of Salih which is balanced again with the '*dâḥikah*' which means 'laughing', because smiling and laughter is conducive to blushing. And the third state of becoming black is balanced by what God says about the happy people: 'And to announce to them with the mercy of their Lord and His acceptance (*riḍwân*)', as in the same way He says about those who deny: 'Forewarn (*bashshir*) them with the most painful suffering.' The happy ones were affected by this word from God, and what they felt within themselves of this joyful announcement showed in their faces

and their faces beamed. In the same way the meaning of the words of God affected them and this effect manifested in their faces. But what appeared in their exterior did not appear in their interior except from the meanings realized by them in their interior, which means that nothing outside of them affected them. What had manifested on the outside of them showed what they had felt within themselves.

In the same way, as in the case of the Word 'Be' (*kun*) when they were ordered to become, they became by virtue of their special inclination and as their ipseity permitted that they became immanent and the immanence came about from them by virtue of their own inclination, therefore that which appears on the outside of a person from among the deniers and the happy ones is what they have within themselves of believing, work and action, and knowledge and conditions and completenesses, and in the same way, denial or wretchedness or deviation and obstinacy is what they have established and made permanent inside them (in their *bâ'in*) from their own ipseity and '*ayn-i-thâbita*. Consequently, the effect is only from their own ipseity and their punishment according to their work is equally from their own ipseity, exactly as to become immanenced is from and due to their receptivity within their receptive *a'yân*. In other words, in whichever way they were established in their *a'yân* they received the image of immanencing according to that, and they became immanenced through the Divine order. And in the same way as becoming immanenced is attributable to them, their punishment is in the same manner attributable to them according to their ability to receive in their existence in their ipseity. Complete absolution for God is established in this over the people because people are wretched (*shaqiyy*) by their own inclination and God only gives them existence through His Merciful Effusion (*fayḍ ar-raḥmân*). If in their ipseity for goodness and happiness there is inclination established, then God gives them that existence and they appear in that existence. If their inclination is established according to the opposite to beneficence (*khayr*), God gives them existence according to the feeling of that, and from them appear the images of wretched denial.

He who understands this Wisdom of Divine Singularity and establishes it in his own *nafs* and makes it for himself witnessed, that is, he who establishes it in the mirror of his own *nafs*, and with the witnessing of this becomes fixed in vision, gives his *nafs* ease, comfort (*râḥah*), and is relieved from attributing the orders that come to him to others and

from appertaining to others. And he will know certainly and definitely that nothing from beneficence and maleficence will be given to him except from his own ipseity, and what I mean by 'beneficence' or 'maleficence' is what is lenient to his character and temper or what is unsuitable to his character and temper and therefore not lenient to it.

Let it be known like this, that the reality of everything is the image of the knowledge of God of that thing from eternity. That image in the Presence of Knowledge is according to the image of knowledge and its necessary relationships and the necessities of the necessaries and their relationships and is essential for its reality. And for God this is not brought about because they are not existent in their *a'yân* but rather for the *ḥaqq* they are established in the existence of the *ḥaqq*. They are not existent in the 'ayn's existence, and there cannot be attribution of ability (*qudrah*) to the becoming of everything except by that which necessitates its reality from eternity, whether they be people of the prophet or saint, or whether they be from among other people. In short, God does not give to them what He gives except that which is necessary by virtue of their reality and what their '*ayn-i-thâbita* requires from eternity. Equally He does not give maleficence except from the person's own ipseity: that which is suitable to each person's aim and is lenient to his nature is beneficence, that which is not suitable to his aim and not lenient to his nature is maleficence. Therefore, in the case of the people in hell, their suffering is caused by the conditions there being not in accordance with their aim and not lenient to their nature. After the passage of time they begin to appreciate that which was contrary to the leniency of their character, and by this appreciation the repulsion to it is removed and that thing becomes suitable to their nature and there is not left punishment or maleficence. Because of this, the suffering of the people of hell becomes changed from suffering and becomes mercy (*rahmah*) and ease (*râḥah*), though it was maleficence before their appreciation and was opposed to the leniency of their nature. The owner of this observation places on their side the totalling of the excuses of all existence, and those indeed who do not find excuses know in reality all moments are subsequent from themselves and result from themselves and from that which was effectively in their own self.

We mentioned this when we said: 'Knowledge is subject to the known' (*inna al-'ilm tâbi'un al-ma'lûm*), and that ability or power and bringing into existence is by virtue of the image of knowledge, and the person then would say, addressing his *nafs*, when that which is against his aim

arrives at him: 'Your hands tied it, and your own mouth blew on it', which means that which happens to you does not come from elsewhere but from your own works and from your own reality which is blown upon by the *nafs-ar-rahmân*. And this saying is current among the Arabs for those who are afflicted by the ills resultant from their own works, and the origin of this saying is this: there was a man who was living on an island in the sea, and he wished to go upon the sea riding on an inflated skin, and he blew into the skin and with his own hands tied the skin but he did not secure the knot, and when he came to the middle of the sea floating on the skin, the air contained in the skin leaked out and that person was drowned. As he was drowning he tried to demand salvation from someone, and that person said: 'Your hands tied it and you blew into it.'

There is also the *ḥadīth*: 'He who finds goodness let him give praise to God, and he who finds other than this let him blame nothing but his own *nafs*' (*man wajada khayran faliyahmid Allāh wa man wajada ghayri dhalika falâ yalûmin illa nafsahu*), and God says: 'To him is what he has earned, and what is against him is also what he has earned. The word of God is truth and the one that leads to the way (*sabîl*) is Truth' (*lahâ mâ kasabat wa 'alayhâ mâ aghtaşabat wa Allāhu yaqûla-l ḥaqq wa huwa yahdî as-sabîl*). So agree with what has been spoken from the place of manifestation of completeness so that you may become led according to the way (*sabîl*) of Oneness and so that you may be guided along the way to Union (*tawḥîd*).

Of the Wisdom of the Heart
(*al-ḥikmat al-qalbiyyah*)
in the Word of Jethro (Shu'ayb)

Know that the heart means the heart of the knower of God (*'ārif billāh*) which is from Divine Mercy. And the heart of the *'ārif* is larger than the Divine Mercy, because it is large enough for the *ḥaqq*. That is to say, it is large enough, with proper largeness of receptivity, to receive the total manifestation of the totality of the images of the Names, whereas the Mercy of *ḥaqq* is not wide enough for the *ḥaqq*. (The Shaykh, may God be pleased with him, explains the heart by the heart of the *'ārif*, because at the level of the select saints (*awliyā'*) the heart which is not the heart of the *'ārif* of God is not a heart, and also he does not mean here any other heart than the heart of the knower of God, not even the heart that knows the Divine Names, because the heart which knows the Divine Names rather than the heart which knows God is a partial heart, and it has no ability to receive the manifestation of the *ḥaqq* in Its total manifestation.)

And the heart of the knower of God in an individuation is the place of the manifestation of each of the Divine Names and is individuated with the individuation of total manifestation. The heart of the knower of God is one of the Divine gifts, and it is given as a gift from the Pure Mercy. This is why it is larger than the Mercy of God, because Mercy (*rahmah*) is one of the Divine Qualities and modes, and it is one thing, and it is not wide enough for the totality of the Names and the forms of the collectivity of the Divine Qualities; and Divine form cannot be contained in Mercy whereas the heart of the knower of God is wide enough for the *ḥaqq*. *Ḥaqq* in the form of the total Divine Ipseity cannot by way of revelation be contained in this. In other words, the Mercy of the *ḥaqq* is not large enough for the *ḥaqq* because *ḥaqq* is *rāḥim* (mercifier) and not *marḥūm* (mercified).

There is no established order concerning the *ḥaqq* for *rahman*, but the language of those knowers of manifestation implies that there is such a situation; however, at the level of those special people who are people of the kernel, the degree of these knowers of manifestation is

the degree of the multitude, because the multitude also understand it that way. Hence, the fact that the *rahmah* of *haqq* is not large enough for the *haqq* is a pointer to the beliefs of the people of multitudes, because in the beliefs of the people of the first comprehension, *haqq* is *râhim* (mercifier) and not *marhûm* (mercified). But had it been that *rahmah* of *haqq* was large enough for *haqq*, then *haqq* would have been mercified. Hence *rahmah* has no order over *haqq* and is not large enough for the *haqq*. But the language of the select people of God points particularly to the fact that God, through the language of the Prophet, qualified Himself with the *nafs-ar-rahmân*, and consequently in the language of the select both *râhim* and *marhûm* are *haqq*, because both in singularity or plurality there is no other being than the Being of the *haqq*. Hence the *rahmah* which is primordial from the station of singularity over the station of plurality, is the *rahmah* of the *haqq* to Its own *nafs*, since the *a'yân* which is called the universe is the same as the *haqq*. In short, the *haqq* at the station of totality of uniqueness is *râhim* and at the station of plurality and qualification by virtue of manifestation is *marhûm*. Equally the great God by the *nafs-ar-rahmân* expanded the Divine Names when they were in annihilation in non-existence; thus again from the point of view of the Divine Names the *haqq* is mercified (*marhûm*). Since the Names, which are Lords (*arbâb*), were in constriction in the *ghayb* and demanded manifestation, then the *nafas-i-rahmâni*, which emanated from the interior (*bâtin*) of the First Self-manifestation (*ta'ayyun awwal*), passing over the *a'yân* of the Names exteriorizing their effects (*hukm*), their images and their *a'yân*, thereby expanding them from constriction, and consequently, through the *rahmah* of the *rahmân*, the Names also become mercified (*marhûm*).

The mercification of the Names which were latent possibilities entails in consequence the totality of manifestation. Therefore, most of these Names and Qualities are in need of the manifested plurality since without them they would not be verified in manifestation; that is, *ulûhiyyah* (Divinity) depends on *ma'lûh* (divinified), and *rubûbiyyah* (Lordship) depends on the *marbûb*, *khâliq* (Creator) depends on *makhlûq* (created), and *qâdir* (Able) depends on the *maqdûr* (enabled), and *râziq* (Nourisher) depends on the *marzûq* (nourished), through which its action and quality becomes manifested. *Haqq* in Its Ipseity is *ghaniyy* of the universes, but Lordship for example does not carry the order of being *ghaniyy* from the universes. It is more likely that the opposite of

this order is necessary. Hence, Lordship is not qualified with being *ghaniyy* from the universes. Hence the *amr* remains between dependency of Lordship on the universe in its quality of Lordship, but *ghaniyy* from the universes with regard to Ipseity. Hence the *ḥaqq* (Ipsity) is by virtue of Its Ipseity *ghaniyy* of the universes, and not *ghaniyy* by virtue of Its Lordship. Yet by its reality and its qualification Lordship is no other than the Ipseity which is *ghaniyy*, and Lordship, like other qualities of the Ipseity, is the same as that which it qualifies. Thus Lord is no other than the Essence by virtue of its origin, since the Essence is in manifestation by Its belonging to Its Names and the quality of Lordship. Since the order of belongingness is in opposition to the belongingness of the Ipseity to the Uniqueness and Absoluteness, these, by their dependency on the universes, are obliged to be not *ghaniyy* from the universes. Here we have *ghaniyy*ness and dependency as two opposing orders, and in the same way, in the origin, the Names are equally in opposition one to the other, such as Guidance and Misleading, etc. Hence the Mercy of God upon the *a'yân* of the universes is His Mercy upon His own Names. So from the state of *ghaniyy*ness, out of mercy for the sake of His own Names which are dependent upon manifesting, He has mercied them by manifesting them, thereby extricating them from their state of constriction. And Lordship is one of these Names which has been extricated from constriction through the Mercy of God through His Name *rabb*, which is dependent on the universes for its establishment. Hence the completion of *rubûbiyyah*, which is dependent on the manifestation of the universes, has through the manifestation of the universes established *rubûbiyyah*; and Lordship is the third degree. The degrees of Names and Qualities which is the degree of *ulûhiyyah* (Divinity) is prior to this. But the *tanfîs* (the breath of liberation) from constriction which occurs by the creation of the universe and is established by Lordship is not necessarily the first *tanfîs*. The first *tanfîs* then is not because of *rubûbiyyah*. The first *tanfîs* is the liberation from constriction of the Divine Names which are by essence in the Ipseity of the *ḥaqq* in His Presence of Knowledge. The *tanfîs awwal* is effected by the exteriorization by the *nafs-ar-raḥmân* in His Presence of Knowledge, of the Divine Names which were already factually present in the Ipseity, where the Names become individuated one from the other. The second *tanfîs* is after this, when the *nafs-ar-raḥmân* brings into being the orders (*aḥkâm*) and the effects and exteriors of the *a'yân* which were factually present in the Divine Names.

The *tanfis awwal* from the degree of *rubûbiyyah* happens with the bringing into being of the universe, because the universe, which is the *marbûb*, becomes realized through *rubûbiyyah*, and the orders and effects of the Names which are present in the degree of *rubûbiyyah* become manifested by that; therefore the first *tanfis* which takes place at the degree of *rubûbiyyah* with the bringing into being of the universe is not necessarily the *tanfis awwal*.

So no matter which way it is looked at, whether the heart is also mercified and the Names are mercified, or whether they are the mercifier and He is the Ipseity, it remains that He is the mercifier of Himself. Therefore He is both mercifier and mercified. Yet this is only by way of explanation. Whichever way you look at it, it remains that the heart is either mercified or the mercifier or that the heart is bigger than the *rahmah* or equal to it. This is a way of explanation.

In reality let it be known after this that at the level of manifestation the great *haqq* varies in forms of images, and that though the heart is large enough for the *haqq* yet all that which is other than the *haqq* in creation cannot fit into it together. That is, the *haqq* by Its *tajalli* fills and is contained completely in the heart with no place left for anything else.

(What the Shaykh signifies and points at here is that for those who know their heart it is by virtue of *tajalli* and that *haqq* in the forms of *tajalli* is variable.) The heart is changeable and variable, and that heart which is large enough for the *haqq* is the heart which is large enough for the totality of the *tajalliyât* of Ipseity and the *tajalliyât* of the Divine Names, and when that fills the heart other forms from among the creations have no place in that heart. That is to say, if the *haqq* is *mutajalli* in that heart by the form of Its Essential *aḥadiyyah*, and fills that heart, it is not possible for this heart to see at the same time anything other than the beauty of Uniqueness or to combine between two images, because at the moment of *wahdah* (oneness) plurality is non-existent because *aḥadiyyah* destroys any otherness. And at that moment of *istighrâq* (drowning) in the Singularity of the *haqq* he cannot at the same time see or feel any other form of *tajalli* or even himself, and only when this *tajalli* of the *haqq* has passed from him can he see or feel other things, and see by virtue of the oneness of Reality and look at the *haqq* and combine between that and other considerations. That is, the heart of the 'arif reaches a degree of largeness wherein it cannot feel a created thing, just as Bayazid Bastami said: 'If the Throne

and the totality of creation, which the Throne contains, was multiplied 100,000 times by 100,000 times, entered and appeared in a corner of the heart, that heart could not have felt it', because the Throne and all that which it contains of creation is limited and definite whereas the largeness of the heart of the 'ârif is indefinite and infinite, because the heart of the 'ârif is large enough for the infinite and indefinite existence. And Junayd, may God be pleased with him, says where it concerns the largeness of the heart: 'How can a heart which feels the ancient, the prior, feel at the same time that which is consequent and later?' And the Throne which contains all, is consequent and later than the *çhadiyyah* which is the Prior and Ancient *haqq* which fills every corner of the heart, and that which is consequent is in a state of annihilation in that priority and cannot be felt. When the *haqq* reveals Itself to the heart of the *kâmil 'ârif* in the image of *açhadiyyah*, there is no other thing with it.

And since the *tajalli* of the *haqq* is variable in forms, consequently by necessity the heart will be large enough or narrow enough according to the forms of the Divine *tajalli*. The heart of the 'ârif or Complete Man is circumscribed by *haqq* and can adapt to the variability of the Divine *tajalli*, because it is perhaps like this that the receptivity of that heart has the ability of total absoluteness by virtue of the Absolute *haqq*, and equally relative by the relativity of the different forms of *tajalli* of the *haqq*, whether these be Divine forms of Names or other Qualities of the *hayûlâ*. Yet the partial hearts are not like this, because they are qualified by conditions or they have aptitudes in one direction or another in accordance with special Divine *tajalliyât*. In consequence the heart of the complete 'ârif is enlarged or narrowed by virtue of the revelation of the *haqq*, and the heart of the non-'ârif, on the other hand, conditions to largeness or to narrowness the revelation of the *haqq* and this is the secret of the revelation of God Himself in different forms and their reception by the people on the Day of Judgement. Because of this, in whatever form the revelation happens, the knower is knower of this and bows to it. But the non-'ârif is veiled by his private belief and does not bow to any other revelation of the Divine *haqq* except to that to which he is inclined, and he denies and seeks refuge from it. The seal follows the form of the bezel, and the heart of the 'ârif or of the Complete is like this, it follows the form of the Divine revelation. Because of the supremacy of the uniqueness of the whole on it, this heart is absolute, and this heart of the 'ârif is constantly in

receptivity and facing the Absolute *ḥaqq*. And if the *ḥaqq* reveals Himself in the form of the Absolute Ipseity this heart receives the manifestation of Absolute Ipseity, and if It is going to reveal Itself conditioned by the forms and limitations of the Names and the differentiations of the degrees of the Names, then the heart will receive the conditioned revelation.

People say that God reveals Himself according to the capacity of the heart of the servant, but the heart of the *'ārif* is not like what they say, unless it is the heart of the *'ārif* which causes the revelation in a form of manifestation, in which case the revelation is in that form. But the heart of the *'ārif* has no definite conditioning so that the *ḥaqq* reveals Itself to it according to that non-condition.

Now, the words of some Sufis that God reveals Himself according to the ability of the servant is according to the knowledge of *fayḍ-ai-muqaddas* whereas what is explained here is according to the knowledge of *fayḍ-al-aqdas*, because the *fayḍ-al-muqaddas* is the revelation of the Names according to the revelation of the *a'yân*, and is ordered accordingly.

For God, indeed, there are two revelations resultant. The first is the revelation from the *ghayb* and the other the revelation of *shahâdah* (witnessing). By revelation from the *ghayb* He gives as gift the essential inclination according to which the heart of the *'ārif* is. And that revelation from the *ghayb* is that essential revelation wherein the *ghayb-al-muṭlaq* is its reality. And that revelation of the *ghayb* is the Divine *huwiyyah* where the *ḥaqq* is the disposition of that *huwiyyah* by virtue of the fact that it gives news of *ḥaqq* from His own *nafs* revealing from the truth of His *nafs*. 'To God is the *ghayb* of the heavens and of earth, and He it is who knows the *ghayb*.' It is like when He says: 'Say: He is the God', wherein He, *huwa*, refers to the *ghayb*. Hence *ghayb* is the Divine *huwiyyah*. Hence the Idioteric revelation which is the *huwiyyah* of the *ḥaqq* is always and forever for the *ḥaqq* in the station of collectivity of the oneness and also in the station of differentiations and in plurality, where from the Ipseity and the *huwiyyah* the essential inclination appears in the *a'yân-i-thâbita*. And *ḥaqq* reveals Itself with the revelation of the *shuhûd* into the heart of *shahâdah* and then the heart sees the *ḥaqq* in that revelation and observes It. Hence the heart becomes manifested in the form of that revelation which He, God, has manifested to it. In this case God has gifted the heart with a non-intrinsic inclination; where this happens according to the inclination in

the revelation which belongs to the *shuhûd*, the heart witnesses the *ḥaqq* and reveals itself to the *ḥaqq* in that image with which the *ḥaqq* has revealed Itself to it. Here the *ḥaqq* has become the same as the belief of the servant. And when the great *ḥaqq* removes the veil which is between Himself and the people of beliefs, each of these people observes the *ḥaqq* according to his own belief. And the observed *ḥaqq* becomes the same as the believer. Therefore, what the servant has observed according to his belief is his own *nafs*. The heart at the level of revelation from the *ghayb*, and at the level of revelation of witnessing, does not feel other than what he believes the *ḥaqq* to be.

In short again the servant does not see in the mirrors of the *ḥaqq* any other thing but his *nafs*. However, the Completed Man who encompasses the *ta'ayyun awwal* and has arrived at the *bâtin* and the *zâhir* of the *ta'ayyun awwal* is the possessor of two faces. One face is interior, one face is exterior. With the face which is interior which is absolute, he faces absoluteness and the absolute *ghayb* and observes it, and he is not conditioned by the form of any one Name and he does not condition *ḥaqq* by any one belief and does not relegate Him to the Presence of any one Name. And with the *zâhir* he is observant of and facing the exterior of the *ta'ayyun awwal* and is receptive of all the Presences of the Presences of the Names therein, and the *ḥaqq* reveals Himself to him by them, and since mirrors are like that which has been revealed, and they have the aptitude for the revelation of all the Presences, he receives the revelation of all the *ḥaḍarât* with the mirror which he has in his being. But he receives the revelation from each Presence with that which exists already in his *nafs*; so that, that revelation from that Presence is suitable for it. That is to say, from the Presence of whichever Name *ḥaqq* reveals Himself, he does not relegate the *ḥaqq* only to that form but accepts whichever form according to whichever belief of the believer the revelation comes. And it shows itself to *ḥaqq* in that variation and takes on that transformation. That is to say, the *ḥaqq* which is in the beliefs and convictions of the people of beliefs is that *ḥaqq* for which the heart of the complete believer is large enough to receive that revelation. And the *ḥaqq* which is believed in is that *ḥaqq* which reveals Itself to the heart. But the heart of the *'arif* knows that the *ḥaqq* has revealed Itself in the form of that belief. That is to say, the *'ayn* of the senses does not observe a *ḥaqq* which is not the *ḥaqq* of a belief, because nothing is large enough for the Absolute Divinity which is the same as the totality of the things, because It is

the same as the total, and it is the heart of the '*ârif*' which is the same as the total which is large enough to receive the *ḥaqq* with total absoluteness, because it is equally variable with the *ḥaqq* with absoluteness and conditioning.

All knowers except the real '*ârif*' are between admission and denial, because though they accept the change brought about in vision of Truth according to beliefs, yet when it comes to their own beliefs they accept no change, and this causes them to deny, with the exception of the true '*ârif*', who knows no matter in what form the *ḥaqq* reveals Itself, and he admits that because he is not the holder of a distinct dogma. Therefore, he observes the Truth in every form, and he is servant and prostrating to It, and the *muwahḥid* observes all forms as One Existent, because he is possessor of absoluteness. That person who has qualified Truth by unlimiting It from all form of belief and not qualifying It even by absoluteness, and removing It from both relativity and absoluteness, does not deny any of the forms of belief of the *ḥaqq* and confirms the *ḥaqq* in any form knowing that the *ḥaqq* reveals Itself in that form and changes into that form. And that complete servant, then, from his ability of total reception of his absolute *nafs*, gives back the value of that form and image and appearance in which the *ḥaqq* endlessly reveals Itself to him. Because for forms of revelation there is no end so that revelation should stop at one level or another according to this. That is, for the complete servant, God reveals Himself endlessly so that by virtue of his being the place of the manifestation of the totality of the completeness of the Uniqueness and by virtue of the degrees of the absoluteness of his personal receptivity and largeness, the form of these revelations and their value and their appearances appear in him in reality, and he accepts that image and returns it to the *ḥaqq* from the absolute ability of the receptivity of his *nafs*, and he appears to *ḥaqq* in the same image in which the *ḥaqq* Itself appeared to him in that revelation. And since there is no end to the revelation and its forms, the complete servant returns the value of that same revelation from his own *nafs* to the *ḥaqq*. This happens because revelation does not manifest without a place of manifestation and the servant is revealed to the *ḥaqq* in that form, and forever the servant with the *ḥaqq* is in that image changed and varied and the revelation of the *ghayb* of the Ipseity dawns constantly from the *ghayb-i-muṭlaq*. The complete '*ârif*' constantly receives this and there is no end to this revelation unless the complete '*ârif*' has stopped at the level of one of these.

And equally, where it concerns the *'ârif* there is no end to the knowledge of God unless the *'ârif* stops at that end. Perhaps on the contrary, the *'ârif* at every era in time requests from the knowledge of God more. And this is why the Prophet, to him peace, by order of God said: *'Rabb zadni 'ilman.'* That is, he required more of the Truth. Therefore the order (*amr*) is infinite from both sides. That is to say, from the side of *ḥaqq* the *amr* of revelation is endless because the revelation of the Divine Ipseity is neither with beginning nor end. In the same way, from the side of the servant the *amr* of the knowledge of God equally is endless, because the knowledge of God is subject to the Divine revelation and the Divine revelation is in perpetuity. Therefore, since the knowledge of God is subject to the endless revelation, knowledge of God becomes equally endless. Because of that, the Prophet, peace on him, was ordered to ask more of the *'ilm*.

Now, as has been seen, the infinite revelation of the Divinity and its form as it gets impressed on the absolute *nafs* of the complete servant, the Complete Man returns to the *ḥaqq* that same value and appearance, and according to the value of that image which he has returned the *kâmil* manifests himself to God. And there is no form or image that the *kâmil* may not accept and witness the *ḥaqq* in it. In short, when the *ḥaqq* reveals Himself to the servant, the servant returns the image of that revelation to the *ḥaqq* and the servant becomes manifest to the *ḥaqq* in that image. Now if you say and if you maintain that being is *ḥaqq* and *khalq* by virtue of collecting all together with the *bâtin*, it is the *ḥaqq*; but if you differentiate between *khalq* and *ḥaqq*, and you say that I am that servant of God, I act through Him and I become that hand of His with which I cling onto Him, and I become that tongue of His with which He speaks, or any other of His members, then you again do not differentiate between *ḥaqq* and *khalq*. Yet according to the *ḥadîth*: 'The *amr* is all of *ḥaqq* and is all of *khalq*' (*al-amr ḥaqq kulluhu khalq kulluhu*). In that case, according to the meaning of this *ḥadîth*, you will say the order to be is totally *ḥaqq* or else it is totally *khalq*, and yet the order to be is by one consideration *khalq*, and by another *ḥaqq*, whereas the order itself is single and the thing which accepts the form of a revelation is exactly the same as that revelation, therefore that thing is both the revealed and the revealed-to. Whether you want to consider it by one consideration *ḥaqq* and by another *khalq*, you will see that the total members and actions is nothing other than *ta'ayyun* or manifestation of the servant and the same as he is.

Consequently, the totality of the order to be is *khalq*; and if you look to the writing where it is said: 'I am the hands and other members of the person', then you find that the *ḥaqq* has made His *huwiyyah* exactly the same as the *huwiyyah* of the servant. Yet the servant has no other existence than his creatural existence. Yet again, since the *huwiyyah* of the *ḥaqq* has become the same as the abilities and members of the servant, then accordingly the totality of existence is *ḥaqq*, and that which receives the revelation and that which is revealed is again the same thing. However, *ḥaqq* is revealed by virtue of the *bâtin*; and by virtue of the *ẓâhir* He is the revealed-to. The truth is, while the existence is One and Unique Essence in which there is no plurality and enumeration possible, it is by this consideration *ḥaqq*, and by another consideration *khalq*. In short, the image of that which reveals itself from the interior of the *ghayb* by virtue of its reality, by the revealing of the Name *ẓâhir*, becomes manifest and becomes the same thing as the image of that which receives that revelation. Therefore, through consideration of the *bâtin*, *ḥaqq* becomes the revealed, and by consideration of the *ẓâhir* He becomes the revealed-to. On the other hand, in the mirrors of existence of the *ḥaqq*, by the manifestation of the *a'yân*, what is revealed is the *khalq*, and equally by virtue of the *ta'ayyun*, that which is revealed to is also *khalq*. Consequently, the revealed and the revealed-to become one and the same thing.

Look how strange this Divine order is. By virtue of Its singular *huwiyyah* in which there is no plurality, and equally in the reality of His Beautiful Names where there is also no plurality, that which is understood of the universes and what is meant by them is one. And though the Single Existence of the *ḥaqq* and Its Essence are constantly in unity where not a single Name can be applied to It, nor an adjective, yet It is at the same time, by virtue of Its Beautiful Names, the universes and multiple.

Let it be known like this, that the *'ayn* of Uniqueness is a single reality. There is no plurality in it. And when you look at the qualified reality, whichever way it is qualified you will still say it is the *ḥaqq* by virtue of its reality, or you will say it is *khalq* by virtue of its devolution (*ta'ayyun*), and if you are to consider the uniqueness of the Essence, then Reality is one, and you will say of course, and there is no existence possible except that. And if you will consider His Essential realization, you will have to say it is *ḥaqq*, and if you are going to consider His Essential absoluteness you will have to say the Essence is absolute from

every angle and consideration. And if you are going to consider Him through His *ta'ayyun* in manifestation, you will say it is witnessing. And if you are to consider His *la ta'ayyun*, you will have to say He is the real Unknowable. And if you are to consider His manifestation in Reality, you will say He is the total manifestation, that is, creation (*khalq*). And if you are going to consider Him from the point of view of *ta'ayyun* and the uniqueness of *'ayn* in *la ta'ayyun* you will have to say His total existence is *ḥaqq*. And if you are going to consider that the exterior of the Being of *ḥaqq* is the *aḥadiyyatu-l-'ayn* (singleness of *'ayn*), forever revealed to its interior, then you will say *ḥaqq* is the revealed and the revealed-to, and this is stranger than strange, that one Reality by Its Essence causes all the different considerations that we have seen, and that all the considerations we have seen are real in each case and that He reveals Himself endlessly and perpetually with all the infinite forms. Now, if the Single Reality reveals Itself in no matter which one of the images, do not you lose yourself from Him in the totality of forms, because that Single Reality is in each *'ayn* and in each belief, and in the *'ayn* of Its devolvement is in transcendence, by the Presence of His Absoluteness and non-devolvement of His Essence by which He is Absolute and far removed from any condition, and equally, in the *'ayn* of His *la ta'ayyun* and in His totality of His *ta'ayyunât* and in their absoluteness He is manifested with the totality of the *a'yân*; manifested that is, to the totality of the *a'yân* yet again: 'Since He is Himself by His Reality' (*min ḥaythu hiya hiya fi ḥaqîqatiha*). All these things are in Him effectively and, you, be surprised with this by virtue of the consideration of that which is considered; and if you will be a verifier of truth, do not be surprised that *ḥaqq* is far removed from there being with Him another being with His Being. In short, the Reality of Uniqueness is the same as all the things that are, whether that thing is intelligent or not intelligent, and to question even that there is such a thing as intelligent and non-intelligent is denial. (Yet the Shaykh, may God be pleased with him, by virtue of interior vision, questions from the Reality of Uniqueness. That is to say: 'What is there that happens to be other than the Reality of Uniqueness?' By this question he means that there is no other existent, because the Reality of Uniqueness is the same thing as every thing, and in existence is the same thing as every being, and his question is a rhetorical question of confirmation. That is, if being is a single *'ayn*, who is the intelligent in the existence of being, and who is the unintelligent, since *ḥaqq* is existent

in every 'ayn and there is no other 'ayn but Him? That is, the 'ayn which is in existence is no other than the 'ayn of *ḥaqq* which is in existence, because *ḥaqq* is the same as every 'ayn among *a'yân*: there is no other 'ayn but the 'ayn of *ḥaqq*.)

If a person generalizes the *ḥaqq* he definitely particularizes It, and the person who particularizes Him, definitely generalizes Him. That is to say, if a person is to witness the *ḥaqq* as manifested upon the generality of instances through His revelation of *rahmân*, that person by virtue of the aptitude of each 'ayn particularizes the *ḥaqq* in each 'ayn, because the *ḥaqq* in each place of manifestation manifests Itself according to the particularity of that place, and the *ḥaqq*'s general appearance in the place of manifestation is particularized by the particularity of all the places of manifestation, and conversely if somebody by virtue of an 'ayn's inclination and particularization particularizes the *ḥaqq* by virtue of the *a'yân* in the generality of *a'yân*, then he generalizes His appearance. But, considering that the *ḥaqq* is the same as all things it means that all being in existence, all *a'yân* are not other than the other *a'yân*, but is the same. Equally the 'ayn of *nûr* (light) is the 'ayn of darkness, and the 'ayn of darkness is the same as the 'ayn of light. And all contraries are like that, because all of them are one reality. If a person is ignorant of what we have said, he finds veils in himself. That is to say, in witnessing singularity he finds his heart veiled and saddened, and never arrives at the vision of the face of unity. Whereas the person who knows what we have mentioned, cannot know what we have mentioned unless he is the completed servant by virtue of great *himmah* and by great strength of direction of heart, and he is never satisfied with anything except the Reality and will not stop at the level of peels and kernels, and will not stop at the level of appearances but will go to the kernel of Reality, the knowledge of which is specifically for the heart. The Quranic verse: 'In this My *dhikr* is for that one who has the heart' (*inna fî dhâlika ladhikrî liman kâna lahu qalbun*). And this heart is the complete heart, because the heart has the ability to vary according to the form it receives because the heart according to the different forms of images and qualities is variable. That is to say, the great God in this *âyat* (verse) of His, appertained the word *dhikrî* (My *dhikr*) to the man who has a heart, and equally as the rest of the sentence denotes (*inna fî dhâlika ladhikrî li ûli-l-albâb*), in these words He appertained it to the *ûli-l-albâb* (people of the kernel), because the kernel of a thing is the heart of it.

Consequently, the *lubb* (kernel) is the heart, and the word *dhikrî* is made private specifically to those of the heart. Because the heart is in the perfect centre between the images of immanence in creation and images of the Divine Qualities of *wujûb* (necessity). And it is able to vary from all images of varieties of immanence of creation to the meanings and Divine Qualities and Presences of Names and is not besieged according to the order alone, and is on the contrary the place and place of manifestation for the total revelation of the Divine Names.

Therefore, Man in the forms of being, by virtue of its variability of form can descend to the images of immanence and become clothed by them even before appearance in this genera, even among the universe of meanings and spirits and in the Presences of the Divine Names and among the *a'yân-i-thâbita* and in the Presences of knowledge; and even when he is afflicted by forgetfulness of the things that he has witnessed with his spirit and his reality, still the heart by virtue of its variability in the meanings and qualifications can revert to His remembrance. Therefore, the word 'My *dhikr*' in the sentence has become a specific for the heart which has changed over from images and qualities. In respect of images of beliefs, because of this variability, the heart in the varieties of qualities and images, of whichever belief into which the *ḥaqq* Itself changes over and reveals Itself as the heart, knows this and becomes a place of rest for it, therefore the heart is not besieged for particular images of *ḥaqq*.

God did not say in the Quran that My *dhikr* is for that person in whom there is intelligence, because intelligence is a condition and does not act except by condition, and it makes fixed an indefinite order in that one single word; whereas the truth, in its being of the order, is contrary to particularization, because the Reality is absolutely devoid both of conditioning and absoluteness. Whereas the heart by virtue of being variable in images is large enough for Reality, especially the heart of the *insân-i-kâmil* which is the reality of human, divine, everlasting, infinite completeness, collectivity of singleness, which is the heart of the Being of *ḥaqq*.

When the fact is as it is, it is impossible to condemn, or better, not to see the reality in opposing beliefs and conditions.

And for the man for whom there is a heart, that person knows the variability of the *ḥaqq* in the image by virtue of the possibility of the heart to be variable in the forms. That is to say, because the heart can suffer the change in the forms, the man who has a heart knows in the

images that the *ḥaqq* has changed its image, because the heart, since it is variable in all the Divine and immanent Presences and in forms and images, is receptive to all the Presences. And equally in the being of the man, the heart is the place of the total Divine Knowledge, because spirit and *nafs* and other spiritual and sensitive forces and limbs and parts of the body are knowers of stations. And total and complete Divine Knowledge is particular to the heart. Consequently, the man who has a heart and is a knower, since he knows his own heart, is variable in forms, and knows that the *nafs* of the *ḥaqq* of God is variable in images. Or if you want in other words, the heart knows from its own *nafs* the *nafs* of the *ḥaqq*. That is to say, he knows the variability of the *ḥaqq* by virtue of the variability of the forms; however, the *nafs* of the knower is, for the *ḥuwiyyah* of *ḥaqq*, no other. And also from the immanence there is not one thing which exists and which comes into being that is other than the *ḥuwiyyah* of the *ḥaqq*; perhaps rather that thing is the same as the *ḥuwiyyah* of *ḥaqq* because otherwise there would have been the necessity of twoness, whereas in reality being is one.

Since, according to the consideration of the real, *ḥaqq* is the same as the totality of things, the one who does not know his *nafs* and is not in knowledge of his *nafs* in these images and denies his own *nafs*, is also *ḥaqq*. That is to say, the one who reveals himself in the images of the knowers who are people of the heart and who are variable and changing in all the images, and the one who appears to the people of doctrines, to each according to the image of their own dogma, and the one who appears in their revelation in the images of their dogma, and the one who knows his being and is *ʿarīf* of it and in knowledge of it and is confirming of this, is *ḥaqq*. And the one who reveals himself in the images of the people of veils and then also is variable in the images of all things, and the one who reveals himself in the images of opposition to his own belief and his own being and from among the people of dogmas specifically manifesting according to the belief of each dogma even though it is against his own belief, and the one who does not recognize and does not know and denies, is also *ḥaqq*.

That is to say, because of the ability of the *ḥaqq* to vary Itself in all images it is the pleasure of that *ʿarīf* and his taste to recognize *ḥaqq* from His revelation. That is to say, to recognize *ḥaqq* from His revelations which are consequent to each place of revelation according to the quality of the revelation, and equally to recognize Him and

witness Him in the 'ayn of totality. That is to say, he who knows his *nafs* in the 'ayn of collectivity (*jam'*) and in the totality of the images of immanence which enter into being and which therein enter endlessly, and he who sees all this as the *huwiyyah* of the *ḥaqq* and witnesses it and is 'arif of the *ḥaqq* with the *ḥaqq*, and to whom the *ḥaqq* reveals Himself with Himself and who is 'arif of this and the possessor of this kind of witnessing, is the possessor of the utmost pleasure and taste and is really an 'arif. Because *ḥaqq* is one and existent and is witness and the witnessed. In other words, through revelation and/or through witnessing through the totality of 'ayn the 'arif who knows *ḥaqq* in these ways is the 'arif who is intended by the words of God: 'The one who has the heart' (*liman kâna lahu qalbun*), that is to say, the owner of that heart who is inclined to change his *nafs* in accordance with the variability of the *ḥaqq* in the images of the revelation. That is to say, the *ḥaqq* in the images of Its revelations has an inclination to vary Its *nafs*, and he is also equally changeable. In whatever image the *ḥaqq* has varied he also varies himself in accordance, and knows Him in that variation. Or equally the heart is variable at the level of the *ḥaqq* varying it, because He says: 'The heart of the believer is between two fingers from among the fingers of the *rahmân*, and He changes it as He wishes' (*qalb-ul-mu'min bayna uşbû'in min aşâbi'-ar-rahmân yaqallibuhu kayfa yashâ'a*). In this sentence it is equally valid to say that the heart is changeable according to the variations of its own *nafs* because the reality of the heart is variability. Hence in all images of change the heart is changeable. In short, the 'arif who is the possessor of a heart recognizes and knows the *ḥaqq* by the *ḥaqq* in all Its revelations of all images, and he is witness to and in vision of the fact that he sees the total uniqueness and the uniqueness of the total through the Being of *ḥaqq*. If that is so, it means that the sentence: '*liman kâna lahu qalbun*'—the afore-mentioned pleasure and taste is particular to the possessor of the heart. And it may be that this is the truth of the matter of the *liman kâna lahu qalbun*.

But the people of beliefs are those imitators who imitate the prophets, peace upon them all, in that which the prophets and the envoys gave them of news of the *ḥaqq*. The ones who imitate people of thought, who refer the news they receive to their intellect and interpret it accordingly, are not imitators. The imitators of the first kind, who imitate the prophets, are those referred to in the words of God as 'to whom We have given hearing.' That is to say, He gave hearing to those

who hear the Divine news as it arrives from the tongues of the prophets. Because the giving of hearing does not happen except at the level of the reception of the Divine news from the declaration from the tongues of the prophets and envoys, peace be on them, which reception does not depend on proofs of intellect. The imitators who are special to this giving of hearing, which group imitate the envoys, excludes the imitators who imitate the intelligentsia who have interpreted these Divine news, referring them to their own intelligence and proofs of intellect, because if the intelligentsia are not capable of understanding and have not understood the reality of the *amr*, the ones who follow them and imitate them are even further in error. In short, the giving of hearing is valid in the case of those imitators of the envoys and prophets. But, however, that which gives the hearing to the Divine news is witnessing.

That is to say, all that has been told by the prophets and envoys of the Divine news, the man who hears these is a witness and is watcher over this; and *shuhûd* sometimes happens to be seeing and seeing sometimes becomes visions and these visions sometimes happen through revelation of *khayâl* and veridic illusion of the feeling from the Presence of *khayâl*, and sometimes it happens that for the realities it happens with visions, and sometimes it happens with the uniqueness of the totality of visions, and it sometimes happens that for the Divine Presence it is through the 'ayn of Reality, and it sometimes happens that it happens in the meaning of witnessing the Ipseity of the Reality through his own Ipseity, and this last is the witnessing of the *ahli wilâyah* (people of *wilâyah*). It also happens because of God's saying of the use of the Presence of *khayâl* that one can see and witness what is represented in the Presence of *khayâl*, but that representation is conditioned and relative. There is further than this: there is the absolute *mithâl* and this begins with vision from the Presence of *khayâl* (i.e. a dream) and goes on through the use of the Presence of *khayâl* for manifesting the *khayâl* images which are present in the strength of the Presence of illusion, and the use of this is dependent on complete cutting-away and withdrawal from images of the senses and from the low universes, and through complete turning towards, with the totality of the heart, to the higher universes. Now the Prophet said: 'The most beautiful gift is to adore God as if you saw Him.' That is to say, the best way of prayer is to pray with the representation of the God he believes in, representing this according to that imagination in complete satisfaction of the heart and turning to God in totality and with complete vision praying to

God. The witnessing through the way of representation in the Presence of *khayâl* is known as *khayâl-al-shuhûd* (witnessing by the *khayâl*). But the Prophet said: 'God is in the niche of orientation (*qiblah*) of the man who prays', and consequently he observes Him there. This is something other than the witnessing by *khayâl*. And if the eye of the man who is praying becomes blinded by the Light of the *ḥaqq*, yet if he is a man of strength of seeing and iron vision, he will observe the *ḥaqq* with the sight of the eye and he does not need total turning of the face or complete scrutiny, but he simply sees it with the eye like that person whose inclination is complete, and whose *kashf* is strong, and who sees God in every direction because God is present in every direction.

Now let it be known that the result of intellectual theory is necessarily relative, and without exception specializes the *amr* in one thing, and the possessor of this quality conditions the *ḥaqq* in an unwitnessed thing, and if somebody imitates this man he does not reach *shuhûd*, because the *shuhûd* which has a being cannot be either conditioned or specialized, because it is on the contrary absolute and the same as each particular, and the person who imitates this has lost all possibility because he cannot witness the *amr*.

The people who imitate the people of theoretical intellect are those for whom God has said: 'God has relieved them from being responsible over their followers.' But the prophets are not relieved of being responsible for those that follow them, because the envoy invites those that follow him according to the vision that he has of Reality, and those who hear him and imitate him believe in what he says and believe in what they witness. Now after that they adhered to the witnessing by the way of their own capacity, imagination and representation, and after that they passed on to seeing and through the way of verification of the *ḥaqq* reached the station of *wilâyah*, and the envoys are not relieved from responsibility for these.

Now my dear friend, verify and research into what I have recalled to you of this Wisdom of the Heart, of the Divine mysteries and knowledge of the Lord, and according to reality become an '*ârif*'.

The reason why the Wisdom of the Heart is ascribed to the prophet Shu'ayb, God have peace on him, and becomes his specialty, is because there is sectioning (*tash'ib*) in the Wisdom of the Heart. That is to say, the Wisdom of this is not particular to one section, because each belief is a section. The totality of beliefs is many sections (*shu'ab*) and *shu'ayb* derives from *tash'ib*—sectioning. And because the heart is also

unparticularized to one thing and on the contrary contains the sections of the beliefs, the Wisdom of the Heart has been assigned to Shu'ayb. If the veils are removed God reveals Himself to His believer as he believes Him to be, yet it also happens that God reveals Himself to the believer in a way that the believer did not expect. That is, on the Day of Judgement, when God reveals Himself to the people, He will reveal Himself in a way that the people did not expect Him to appear, and it so happens that for the people of belief, that which they believed in is not in accordance with what they see. And it becomes manifest to them from God that which they did not think would come and in which they had not believed, and most often it happens that most of the beliefs are shown in opposition to the belief of the believer so that in the order there is opposition when the vision appears. That is to say, in the Divine orders there might be opposition but never in the Ipseity. And it also is that for some who believed in what they thought was the *huwiyyah* of their belief, the revelation made to them is different from what they expected.

Now, the difference in the vision of the believer and in what he saw to be his belief is like the case of the man of the Mu'tazilite sect, which insists that God's promise invariably involves the execution of that promise. Such as when God promises to the rebel against Him that He will punish him and the rebel dies without repentance, the Mu'tazilite expects that promise of God to be executed on this man; but if that rebel has died and is mercified by God, certainly he will not be punished because that rebel will find God both forgiving (*ghafûr*) and merciful (*rahîm*), and for anybody who finds Him both *ghafûr* and *rahîm*, God will treat him with original benevolence (*faḍl*). But the Mu'tazilite is not aware of all this and was expecting the execution of the promise, yet the contrary has happened, and it appears that he is forgiven. Now, let it be known like this, that if a rebel dies without repentance, two things may interfere with the execution of that which is promised by the promise. First it might be that God's benevolence has been passed over that man. If a man who has the benevolence of God passed over him and because of external conditions has succumbed to certain kinds of rebellion and has died without repentance, the Divine benevolence and the original purity becomes predominant in his case and his rebellion is changed into good deeds by virtue of the Quranic saying: 'God changes his sins into good deeds' (*yubaddilu Allâh sayyi'âtihim ḥasanât*). Or it happens that at the level of the Divine Majesty rebellion

is abolished according to the Quranic saying: 'God abolishes that which He pleases, and establishes' (*yamḥū Allāh mā yashā'u wa yuthbit*). Therefore, it happens that in manifestation the execution of the promise and that which is promised is removed from that rebel. And another form is like this, that God is true in His promises, that He has promised him the non-execution of His promise according to the *mashī'a*—nature—of the case, and according to His saying that He praises the going beyond the execution of that which is promised, (e.g. the Quranic advice wherein the killer is to be executed in return for his misdeed, yet the immediately following verse says but it is better to forgive). In short, promise is in the order of the promise and the promise must be true and executive but the order is not necessarily on the actual execution. There is also the case that when God appears to the believer in the form of his belief while in this world in His Reality, then the believer sees that his belief which had been specific according to his imagination and belief was not the Reality, and then his misbelief is translated into belief in the Reality and instead of being ignorant he becomes knowledgeable; from then on, what he misbelieved in becomes lifted from him. After reverting to Truth and the vision is clarified by the light of vision, that eye does not become blind again, because specific beliefs and dogmas are only peculiar to the people of veils. Yet even in other cases, because of God's revelation in different images at the level of vision, when God reveals Himself to him in the *huwiyyah* of his belief, it is different from what he expected it to be, because God may reveal Himself in the different images of His Names, and after having revealed Himself in this way God then reveals Himself again to the man in the way he used to believe in, because there is no repetition in revelation, because it is impossible that God's revelation be in one image many times, because the Divine Names and the Divine happenings are infinite and indefinite and God is permanent in revelation and there are never two revelations the same. Something had manifested to the people of belief from God concerning the Divine *huwiyyah* before the final *kashf*, (that is, when they were still alive,) in which they had believed, having calculated that that revelation was the reality. Consequently, the revelation in the other world which is contrary to what they had believed in in the life of the senses, and the witnessing of this new revelation, is one of the causes of progress after death. And in fact we have mentioned the development that takes place after death, and its images, in our book called 'Divine Revelations', during the mention

of the level in which we were together at the *kashf* with that person. And also we mentioned this matter of development after death to them in whose level this was not present. Now, there is the Quranic saying that he who is blind before death, in the other world is also blind, and the Prophetic saying that the action of the human being is stopped at death, both sayings which denote that there is no possibility of advance after death. They refer only to the veiled ignorants who are permanently cut off from the remembrance of God and they are people of covering (*kufir*) and polytheism (*shirk*). But for those who want to know the Reality and people of *tawhīd*, and people who imitate them and check themselves by what they hear from these people, development after death exists by virtue of the fact that their veils are lifted after death, and by virtue of pardon and forgiveness which eliminates their shortcomings, and by virtue of their coming into contact with people of *ḥaqq* in the higher *barzakhs* whom they had been imitating more or less while in the world, and for whom they had love and believed in their sayings, and the *ahli-ḥaqq* in their *barzakhs* from their spirit give them succour. (The Shaykh mentions in his book 'Revelations of Arriving', that he has met with many people in their *barzakh*, like Hallaj and Junayd and Sahl and many others of the great ones of the *ahl-ullāh* (people of God), and has discussed with them their beliefs in the images concerning God according to their degrees of knowledge and gnosis and gave them advice on things higher than their knowledge and gnosis allowed them and helped them in their development and advance and opened up the knots they had in their beliefs concerning the *ḥaqq* and out of his beneficence explained the knowledges which were beyond their station and gave them the gift from the knowledges of *tawhīd* the reality of witnessing through the channel of the uniqueness of the totality of the total, may God be pleased with him and with them all.)

It is of the strangeness and peculiarities of the order that Man is definitely, by virtue of his original inclination which he draws from the *ghayb*, constantly in improvement, but he does not know that he is improving and this is due to the thinness and delicacy of the veils and because the images resemble closely the one to the other in revelation. And in truth this similarity is like God says, that the nourishment seems to be the same, but is not. However, the man is constantly in advance, because of the *aḥwāl*, because of the inclination of his '*ayn-i-thābita*. The *aḥwāl* of the *a'yān* are the orders known at the level of God which

are fixed in the *a'yân* in strength, and during Man's devolvement from the Knowledge of God to the *a'yân* of immanence transforms and exteriorizes the *ahwâl*, which are with strength fixed in the *a'yân*, into actions. In other words, from eternal original inclinations God manifests the infinity of non-original inclinations by virtue of His revelations and because of the necessities of manners and beings in this world and in the other world, and equally in the *barzakhs* and in the Last Day and in the realms of good deeds and in visions and in the other realms of other-worldly indigences, and in the higher degrees and due to his consciousness and non-consciousness, because all that has entered the realm of being and has become being by virtue of the being of the *wâjibu-l-wujûd* (a being necessary in itself), becomes *wâjibu-l-wujûd* itself, and consequently cannot be reverted to non-existence. As a result of all this it is constantly in renewal and advance, because, always, absolutely always, it is perpetually receiving the perpetual Divine revelation of being and with each revelation his reception of the revelation which follows is increased. But it sometimes happens that he is not aware of his advance, because if he is of the people of the veils, by virtue of the thinness and delicacy of his veil Man is forever in revelation which revelation is constantly dominant over him. And for each inclination and revelation the consequent revelation is increased, which are the revelations of knowledge of witnessing of *hâl* and of stations or of consciousness, because of totalling and because of the totalling of the totalling and because of the uniqueness of the total and individuation and because of the similarities of the images of revelation Man does not recognize it, because revelations are not in strict order, exactly like the similarities of the nourishment which arrives at different times, and though they resemble each other, the first one is not the same as the one that follows. Though they are all nourishment, they are resemblant nourishment; they are not the same as each, but different. At the level of *ahli-kashf* and verification the difference between the devolvments is obvious and manifest, whereas at the level of people of the veil it is hidden.

At the level of the man who understands that the similarities are similar but therefore different in devolvement, he understands equally that in witnessing, it does not necessitate differentness in the *shuhûd*. Therefore people of verification see the multitude in one. In fact the person of *kashf* sees the plurality in one. That is to say, he sees the plurality of the *a'yân* in similarity of image which are infinite and which are visible and manifested and he witnesses them in one singular '*ayn*.

As we already know that in fact the meanings of the Divine Names indeed have different and multiple realities, yet definitely the thing they mean is one 'ayn; such as what is meant by *qâdir*, 'alîm, *khâliq*, *râziq*, are all God and in fact are one. Therefore, what is meant by all the Divine Names is the One Ipseity. Hence this plurality is intelligible in the singularity of 'ayn (*aḥadiyyatu-l-'ayn*). The meanings and differences of the Names are relative pluralities in that which is named and which is of one 'ayn. By virtue of differences of their reality and with this differentness of realities the Names refer all invariably to the One Essence, and are intelligible in that. At the level of the images of Names and revelation the plurality is witnessed in the singleness of 'ayn, and the singleness of 'ayn is therein intelligible, and because of this, *huwiyyah* becomes covered over by the images of existences, and it manifests them. But in the Last Day of Judgement the images of existence become covered and *ḥaqq* manifests with His Ipseity. It is at this point that the Quranic saying where both the question and its answer is given by God: 'To whom is the belonging today? To God, the One and All-Destroyer' (*liman al-mulku al-yawm? Lillâhi!-wâḥidi-l-qahhâr*). The totality of similar revelations is the singularity of the reality and plurality by their devolvment. At the level of revelation it is the One 'ayn. At the level of witnessing and becoming, it is plurality. Therefore, the observable plurality is manifest in the singleness of 'ayn and sensible there. And the singleness of 'ayn becomes in the witnessed plurality interior and intelligible.

Hayûlâ is not existent in the exterior; it is in the intellect. For all high and low beings this is materia and contains the totality of both the existent and non-existent, known and intelligible realities. Its existence is the same at all times as the *a'yân* of the ancient or recent existences. Its existence is dependent on the existence of people, because it receives the images of all existences and is apparent in them and all images are again returned to it, because it is the reality and substance for all images, which means to say that the *hayûlâ* is taken to the limit of each image by virtue of the differences and pluralities of the images, and in reality the totality of images all refer back to a single jewel, whereas at the same time, this single jewel is a *hayûlâ* for those images. That is to say, the plurality of Names is witnessed in the singleness of 'ayn and the singleness of 'ayn is therein intelligible, in the same way as the images of the totality of existence are visible and witnessable in the 'ayn of the *hayûlâ* and the *hayûlâ* is intelligible in those images.

Consequently, whenever a thing from among the existent things is described, the *hayûlâ* is described in that way, because though the *hayûlâ* does not diminish from its intelligibility by the fact that all the images manifest from it, it itself is visible and manifests in all images. But the *hayûlâ* becomes limited by the limitation of the totality of all images. You can say, describing your intellect, the intellect is that jewel-apart which is capable of understanding in totality and in partiality without appertaining to a form, and in describing your *nafs* you say the *nafs-i-nâtiqa* is the jewel-apart capable of understanding in totality and in part, and has the ability, the relationship, of precaution (*tadbîr*) and expenditure by its form. (That is, it can think in advance and act physically.) And equally in describing the physical body, you can say the body is a receptive jewel in three dimensions. In each of these descriptions, you have taken the jewel to describe it, but in reality the jewel is one. But the images it gives are many and different; therefore the totality of the images of realities refer back to the jewel which is one. And the jewel is for the totality of images the *hayûlâ*, and the *hayûlâ* is the jewel. Now, while the Divine Names and Qualities were an intellectual plurality in the Divine Ipseity which is a single 'ayn, at the level of revelation that singleness of 'ayn becomes plurality of witnessing and vision, and the Ipseity of the *ḥaqq* which is a single 'ayn remains intelligible. Therefore, the Ipseity of *ḥaqq* which is the single 'ayn is by Its own *ghaniyyness* Rich beyond Need of the universes, but by virtue of His Qualities like creativity, nourishing, ability, with the images of Its Names It is variable and is manifest in the opposing immanent definitions, and by virtue of the reality all the images of revelation refer back to It and belong to It. Yet between creativity and nourishingness there is established difference between the two images of revelation, yet all the time the Quality which is powerfulness is in differentiation in opposition to the other Qualities of the Divine Qualities. And if a person knows himself according to this knowledge, that is to say, if a person knew his *nafs* as the Reality of the *ḥaqq* which is manifest forever in all the images of possibility, and if he knows that *ḥaqq* is manifest in him, he definitely knows the *ḥaqq*. Because certainly and definitely God has created Man in His own image. Further perhaps, Man is the same as God's *huwiyyah* and the same as God's Reality.

By this word 'image' is meant the image of the totality of the Names and the totality of the Qualities of the *wujûb*. Which means that the man who is Perfect Man with his total capacity is the place of

manifestation of the Divine image and realized and qualified by the totality of the Names and Qualities. Rather perhaps the Man is the same as this *huwiyyah* of the *ḥaqq* which is hidden in the reality of Man, and it is this reality that is covered in the reality of Man and manifests the Man. Therefore, the *huwiyyah* of Man is the same as the *huwiyyah* of *ḥaqq* and his reality equally is the same as the Divine Reality, because his reality is the image of the Divine Presence.

The doctors and knowledgeable people of the visible world, not one of them came to know the knowledge concerning the *nafs* and its reality, except only from the prophets, from the people among the Sufis and the divines. Because the envoys and people of the Sufis are '*ârif*' of their *nafs* and by virtue of the fact that the reality of the *nafs* is the same as the *huwiyyah* of the *ḥaqq*. And there is not one of the doctors and knowers of the past who have come to this reality, because this reality is not obtainable by philosophical deduction.

Now let it be known like this, that the realities of all the *nafs* are from one *nafs* which is the *nafs* of the *ḥaqq*. But the images of the *nafîs* are the luminous revelations in the *nafs-ar-rahmân* through which the *ḥaqq* enlarges (*tanfîs*) them in the images of immanent forms. If the *nafs* is partially a *nafs*, that *nafs* is an image from among the images of the total and one and *rahmân nafs* which has been blown upon with the material of luminous and *rahmân nafs*, and if the *nafs* is from among the *nafs* a total *nafs* which is the *nafs* of the *insân-i-kâmil*, that *nafs* is the same as the *ḥaqq* which was manifested at the level of the reality of the servant, and it is that single *nafs* from which all the other *nafs* have been created. That *nafs* by virtue of its reality in images receives maleness or femaleness, because maleness and femaleness are for it two ipseities, and maleness is action and femaleness is reaction. And that single *nafs* from which we are all created, and from which its wife is created, is the *nafs* of the High God who from it brought forth the individual human beings, and we are appointed to protect for our Lord that same *nafs* because of the saying: 'And indeed God has preserved for you His *nafs*' (*wa yazarakum Allâh nafsa*), through knowledge of that same *nafs* which in us protects the Lord for our *nafs*, from everything from which we have fear and from which protection is needed. And because the *nafs* is the same as the *nafs* of the *ḥaqq* we appertain the totality of the praises to the *nafs* and the totality of all blames equally to the *nafs* because it is our own *nafs*. This is because *nafs* possesses two faces: one is by virtue of our being the image of its

essential reality, in which case that reality is the same as itself, and this reality is the reality of the plurality and the images of its parts are not infinite, and the other face is that the *nafs* accepts relationship to the *ḥaqq* by virtue of the fact that that which manifests in the *nafs* of the *nafs* is the *nafs* of the *ḥaqq*. And the fact that the *nafs* is the *nafs* of the *ḥaqq* is from the stations of closeness and supererogatory works. And these two closenesses are for the *nafs* by which it has two faces, because in the closeness of supererogatory things *ḥaqq* is the same as our *huwiyyah* and is our hearing and our seeing and hands and legs and other forces we have, and is by virtue of being the same as our *a'yân* and our *nufûs*, and at the level of closeness of obligations we are the image of God wherein He speaks with our language. That is to say, we are that tongue of His, which has been established by the saying: 'God has heard he who has praised Him' (*sami' Allâh liman ḥamida*). And because of this face we are the tongue and the eye and the hearing of God. With this aspect we are by virtue of God; with the other aspect which is the first aspect, He is our hearing and sight and other powers and is our exterior. Now if God is by our manifestation manifested to us, we are in His uniqueness of *ghayb* His protector from the plurality of witnessing, and if thus God in the uniqueness of His *'ayn* comes into manifestation we become His interior and He becomes the same as our abilities, members and *nufûs*, and if this is so by virtue of His oneness of unification it is the *nafs* of the *ḥaqq* and by virtue of relationship and infinite sections He is the same as us. And if we know the *nafs* in this manner of largeness we come to know through the reality of knowledge exactly as the reality. 'He who knows himself knows his Lord' (*wa man 'arafa nafsahu faqad 'arafa rabbahu*). And we become realized with the reality of the *nafs* as in this sentence, because this single *nafs*, which is by virtue of His *huwiyyah* of the *ghayb* single, is the same as the *nafs* of the *ḥaqq* and is also by virtue of His Himselfness and Self-individuation the same as our being. This is so because for Him indefinite number of Himselfness is possible and occurs by the personality of each of those. And this many Himselfnesses is the image of the relativity of the Divine *huwiyyah*. However, if the *nafs* in its own devolution should manifest itself with its singularity of *huwiyyah*, we would be annihilated in its *huwiyyah* and become the *bâtin* of that *huwiyyah* in our state of annihilation. In this case then we become, in matter of *huwiyyah*, the same as that *huwiyyah* and we are not us. But if the *nafs* manifests in the images of its multiple 'I'-nesses we become

manifest and He becomes our interior *huwiyyah*. This way the protection in two aspects of the *nafs* for Him becomes realized.

Nafs by virtue of its own 'ayn is single, and by virtue of itself and us several, but the devolvement of the *nafs* is through the totality of the *nafs-i-rahmâni*'s singularity by virtue of which the *haqq* enlarged our restriction of non-existence from our reality of the *ghayb* since we were during the *ghayb* present in it. That original non-existence by virtue of our *a'yân* is our relative non-existence. That is to say, God enlarged our annihilated *a'yân*, that is to say, by His *nafs-ar-rahmân* the *haqq* removed that restriction from our *nafs* which was existent in our reality by destruction, by uniqueness in the state of our annihilation. God brought into being our *a'yân* together with His 'ayn and together with that *nafs* of His through which He mercified us and enlarged us; thus we were manifested in the *nafs* of the *haqq* through the *nafs* of the *haqq*. And understand this.

Other than the divines and envoys and great *awliyâ*', not one person of the ancient or the new ones who is man of vision and intelligence and doctrinaire people, none of them have understood this Divine knowledge or have been realized with the reality of the *nafs*. Because they worried about sectors, missing the underlying reality due to their veils, and they worried about whether the *nafs* belonged to the body, or to the essence, or was something added on to it, whether inside the body or outside, or whether it enters the body or exudes from it. As far as their meanings go, all they say is true, because the body is the place of manifestation of the *nafs* and any explanation with that is true, but none of them reached the reality, the itselfness, the *huwiyyah*, the 'ayn, the *ghayb*, its creatureness, its servanthood and its Lordship. And it is as if they wasted what God from His *rahmah* gave them as determination to find. They are in part right and in parts wrong, and they are like some tubercular person who is at the same time fat. If a man desires to know the reality of the *nafs* through the body and its manifested appearance and through logical deduction, he is exactly like the person who, though fat, is dying of tuberculosis. And these people fall into the category of the saying: 'And he who desires the *amr* without its own manner or way cannot conquer its reality.' This is a definite saying which asserts that if somebody desires an *amr*, he cannot go after it through another way, foreign to the *amr* itself. If he does follow another way than that required by the *amr* he will not conquer its reality.

For those who are using their intellect, God has said it is because they are clothed in the new creation. This means that they do not realize that the universes and the *nufûs* were created in one 'ayn, and that they were changed into the new creation of every instant. And they do not know that in every moment and in every *nafs* the creation of the universes is renewed through Divine revelation. The universes by their own *nafs* are inexistent; they are existent with the existence of the *haqq*. And the *haqq* is forever and infinitely always in manifestation. Where it concerns the return of the prior revelation, the universes become inexistent, and at the level of the reappearance of the following manifestation they come into existence and are recreated. But because of the quickness of the revelations which follow each other and the joining of the light of the following revelation with the prior revelation, there is no differentiation visible between the two revelations; it is because of this that the universes cannot be observed as being, then not being, and being again. And the people who are looking at the image of the exterior of the universes, the people of thought, imagine that whether the realities are original or added on in the case of their being dressed by the body, they think that there is no change and no difference between the past moment and present. Now, there is not anything which enters the realm of being which becomes non-existent, but in non-existence there is no necessity for non-change and the matter of changeability does not necessitate the existent things to be non-existent, because the great God is constantly and forever, permanently in revelation, and the universes are permanently in reception of these revelations, and therefore being never can become non-being; consequently and equally there can be no moment of non-existence. But had there been a moment of non-existence there would be a moment when there was no God. But at the level of revelation the creation of the universes is constantly in a new creation. But since the universe is dependent on the Being of the *haqq*, in this there is no difference or change.

Let it be known like this then, at the level of the majority of the people of veils, what is seen is both *haqq* and other than the *haqq*, and it is manifest and observable. And *haqq* Itself is hidden and not present, and because of this It is changeable through the universes of the *nafs*, and where it concerns the *nufûs*, creation is renewed while the singularity of the 'ayn, which is its reality, remains fixed, because the totality of the universes is changing constantly, whether it is original or secondary,

and the condition of each change is changeable with itselfness always. Therefore, that which is present in one instant is different to that which is present in another instant, though, in spite of all this, all these changes happen from the One 'ayn. Now that single 'ayn is the Reality of *ḥaqq* which is revealed through the *ta'ayyun awwal*. And the totality of the images are added-on things which vary in every instant. Consequently, people of logic and intellect and the majority of the people of the world are in the clothing of the recent creation together with the totality of the images of the universe of *nufûs* where it concerns the reality of the universes. Consequently God, in these revelations which follow each other, is revealed and witnessable, and the universes are forever hidden, and at every point of vision it is annihilated and is present in the images that follow in the second revelation. Thus, those people, by saying that that which is in being does not change, prove the existence of the singularity of 'ayn, but they do not see the difference between the singularity of the 'ayn and its happenings and states, and the necessities and the qualifications of the moments which are subject to it, and they describe its manners and its *aḥwâl* by the fixity of the quality of the Ipseity of the singularity of the 'ayn. But they have made a mistake. Some made the mistake by lack of knowledge, because the intelligible jewel and the image of the universe in detail and their knowledge is dependent on the knowledge of the *hayûlâ*. The person who does not know the *hayûlâ* cannot distinguish between beings. And the person who does not know the reality of things by which the existent things differentiate one from another cannot differentiate between things. But had they been believing in the intelligible jewel as being of the singleness of 'ayn, they would have reached in the *amr* the degree of realization. And the fault of the other is that though they were conscious of the matter of the non-remaining of two times, still they did not know that it is through the annihilation of knowledge in fact that the totality of the universe is the totality of the contingencies. Therefore, the universe is changeable at every instant because there is no two times, and the universe is a contingent.

Now know it like this, that the Ipseity of the Uniqueness, which is the singularity of 'ayn, is in Its Ipseity permanent and permanently present, and in Its Ipseity is transcendent from the plurality of Names and numbers of Qualities. The totality of the Divine Names and Qualities and the plurality of the images of immanence are in annihilation in It and are only intelligible, and it is only when the *nafs-i-raḥmâni* and

the Divine revelation and the images of the Divine Names, for the purpose of polishing and repolishing and manifesting and showing, appears in the images of the manifested immanence which is in annihilation but intelligible in the Divine Ipseity, then the plurality, which is intelligible in the Divine Ipseity, appears and at this point the Divine Ipseity becomes intelligible and interior in plurality. In fact what is witnessable in manifestation is that plurality which is the being of the universes by virtue of the *ḥaqq* having devolved into that, and exists only with referential being. And in the mirror of the Being of *ḥaqq*, like the image which can be observed in a mirror, the being of the universe is also observable; outside of that it has no existence. When in the mirror of manifestation the images of the universe which are the interior revelation but by virtue of manifestation a devolved existence of the *ḥaqq*, which is annihilated in the Unity of the *ḥaqq*, it appears in the mirrors of the universe and is visible and existent in the exterior, and the plurality of *a'yân*, and the unity of the Ipseity remain collected and intelligible in the interior. But since the Being of the *ḥaqq* is revealed and devolved into the mirrors of the images of the universe, it can be considered that what is observable and manifested is the plurality of the existence of *ḥaqq*, and in each place of manifestation, manifesting according to the necessity of that place and conditioned by it. And by virtue of devolvement where the *a'yân* which were intelligible in the existence of *ḥaqq*, when the *ḥaqq* reveals Itself in the mirrors of the *a'yân*, the *ḥaqq* which is conditioned by the *a'yân*, and the intelligible *a'yân* in the mirror of the existence of the single *ḥaqq*, appear. So again the plurality which is visible and manifest is the existence of the universe by virtue of the devolvement of the *ḥaqq* into it.

Whether we call this manifested plurality by virtue of its being the thing devolved to, or the thing conditioned by the devolvement, or whether we call this *ḥaqq*, or whether by virtue of its being conditioned by the devolvement we call it the universe, still, from the interior, the Divine revelations are constantly following each other from the Ipseity of Uniqueness. If the observable plurality is considered as the Being of the *ḥaqq* by virtue of the constant and endless revelation the visible images are at every moment variable because *ḥaqq* is variable in images. And if we consider it, by consideration of the observable plurality, as the universe, the universe also exists by Divine revelation and the arrival of revelations are constantly following one another. And the universe becomes variable and changing by virtue of the fact that the prior

revelation reverts back to its origin and by virtue of the fact that the following revelation follows it. Therefore the interior of realities are manifest in the images of the universe, and the realities of the universe are equally made real and existent in the *bâtin*. Simply then, the outside of existence is plurality and the inside is singularity. The *bâtin* of the Being of *ḥaqq*, which is the Ipseity of *aḥadiyyah* and singularity of 'ayn, is in relation to the images of the universe, and the images of the universe are in relationship to the *bâtin* of the *ḥaqq*.

And the existent differences of plurality in the images of the universe are returnable to the *hayûlâ* which is the singular jewel, by which fact the *hayûlâ* is manifested in the images of the universe. The intelligible jewel is the *hayûlâ*, and because of that, singleness and plurality is explainable. The intelligible jewel is the *aḥadiyyatu-l-'ayn* because the intelligible jewel is not in manifestation except by the images, and the reality of the images cannot be intelligible except by the jewel. The reality of *ḥaqq* is that It is the singularity of 'ayn and that It reveals Itself in the images of the world. And it is not true that the changes of the universe are totally and particularly veridic. But if one had said that the Reality of Uniqueness is fixed, and had known this to be true, people would see that behind the changes there is a singleness of reality, which in its own reality and by necessity of its own reality, is not variable and changeable. And this manifestation by revelation and by devolvement is from His beneficence, and it is capable of receiving in its own 'ayn all the images of contingencies, and this plurality of contingency and devolvement and taking-on of bodies is not a condition of the Reality of Uniqueness. And consequently the totality of the universe is called contingent and is the totality of the images and are manifested in the Uniqueness of Ipseity which is the oneness of 'ayn, whereas the Being of *ḥaqq* which is singleness of 'ayn is manifest in the totality of images. The universe is present through the being and the manifesting of *ḥaqq*, because the universe by its own *nafs* is not permanent and is inexistent. Not one thing of the universe is the jewel, because the jewel has to be self-existent and the only thing that is self-existent is the Being of *ḥaqq*, and the things are not self-existent but exist by the self-existence of an existent and are not self-existent. And all that which is relative to the existence of the *ḥaqq* is contingent. And if people know and prove that the single jewel is self-existent and devolved into all the images and capable of receiving them, and that being is singular of 'ayn and uniqueness of reality and the Being of

ḥaqq, then these people are the victors and the '*ârif*s and know the *amr* as it should be.

This being so, yet it also shows that in the limit which is for the things, it becomes apparent that the totality of the universe is contingency. And it becomes apparent that this limitation in the things and this contingency is self-subsistent and the same as the jewel, because the limitation of a thing in itself is the same as that which is limited; therefore contingency becomes self-standing and becomes the same as this jewel which is self-standing at the limit of the thing which is limited. And that thing which is contingent is not self-subsistent. People who define the jewel as a jewel which stands by itself are limiting it, and in this explanation they use self-standing, whereas self-standing is a contingent. So if you say for instance that Man is a speaking animal, the word 'speaking' is a contingency. And if you describe an animal by saying it is a sensitive body, moveable by will, you are saying this is a body whose name is sensitive, moving by will, then the body is contingent, because it is conditioned, and the thing conditioned is contingent. In the same way, growing is contingent because it is something added on to something else, and in the same way sensitivity is contingent, because sensitivity is the same as understanding and understanding is contingent. In the same way movement is contingent because it is something added on. And in the same way will is contingent, and even receiving is contingent, and it is then obvious that the self-standing jewel is the same as its contingency and its reality, because jewel has become contingent to self-standing. In this way the whole universe is contingent and the contingencies taken at the limit of the jewel become the same as the jewel and all these contingencies become the jewel. The result is that that which does not stand by itself becomes standing by itself. From the totality of contingencies which do not stand by themselves there appears a contingency which stands by itself. That is to say, while it was a contingent and not standing by itself it became self-standing in the description of the jewel; thereby it has become the same as the jewel and therefore self-standing. In short, the totality of things, which by themselves are not standing and which by themselves are contingencies, have become a thing which stands by itself and which is the jewel. And this jewel is not a contingent order according to the totality of the contingencies mentioned in its limits, because the jewel is the *amr* which results from the totality of the contingencies. Now, though the parts of the limits of the jewel itself and the essential reality

of this jewel is certain, there is no realization in the *nufûs* of its parts, because these parts are contingencies. If you say for a body that it is long and wide and deep, you have by these three dimensions limited it by what it is and how it is, but these are contingencies; all these are meanings and are not realized in themselves and standing except in the *amr* which is the totality of these contingencies, because the jewel which is long, wide and deep is not an added-on thing to these contingencies, and it is an intelligible meaning that the totality of these contingencies is the jewel, and there is no other *amr* than this for the jewel realized in its '*ayn* and there is no other existence for it. And for the jewel to receive the contingencies of the body is in its essential being, and reception is therefore in the essential being of the jewel, and become parts of its essence.

Now if you say that the jewel which is a body is the body of the jewel with the ability to receive the three dimensions, reception becomes a part of the essential being, but only when each limited part of the essential parts of the being is considered as being the being itself. And each of these parts is absolute, that is to say, every part of the limited is absolute, because the ipseity of the limited is the same as the limited and its *huwiyyah* and the essential being becomes part of what it is (its *mâhiyyah*). And there is no doubt in fact that receptivity is its contingency because receptivity does not stand by itself, and receptivity becomes the adjective of the receiver, because the receiver cannot exist except in receiving receptivity and be contingent to it. Whereas receptivity is for the jewel its essential being, that is part of its ipseity, because the parts of the person are of the personality of the personified. And since receptivity is not an added *amr* to the personality of the jewel, it is therefore the same in existence. Consequently, at the level of the self of the personified body, reception is a relative to it which is not existent outside of it; and considered from the outside they are not added on to it, but they are itself, except perhaps in the intellect. In this case, this receptivity is for the jewel its ipseity, and that which is an ipseity for a thing, is the same as itself, because the personal limitations of the person is the same '*ayn* and the same *huwiyyah* as that which is personified and that which is limited by its essential parts, and each part of the limited person is called that person and can be described by each part of it. Therefore, receptivity is of the essentiality of the jewel, and for a thing that which is essential to it is a part of its *mâhiyyah*; therefore receptivity is the same as the *huwiyyah* of the jewel.

In this way, something which is in two times, which is a thing that does not exist, becomes existent as two times or many times, and the thing that does not exist by itself, exists by itself by appertaining to that thing. And the parts of the jewel which are its contingencies become the same as the jewel itself. But when you say that the jewel is the same as the contingencies and is not an added *amr* to the contingencies, in this consideration the jewel itself can be seen as contingent. And the jewel becomes the totality of the contingencies of the universe. Therefore it is an error not to see that the universe is a totality of contingencies and is interchangeable with itselfness and that not a thing from the universes is a self-subsistent jewel. That is to say, it is wrong not to know that the existent which is present in its 'ayn by virtue of its own 'ayn is the Being of the Absolute *ḥaqq* whose Being is present by Its own Ipseity. And the thing's existence is perishable, and only exists in every moment by His existence. But the *ahli-kashf* and *ahli-taḥqīq*, they see that verily the great God reveals Himself in every breath, yet revelation *never* repeats itself, so though they see Him revealed in every breath, there is no repetition in revelation and there is neither intellectually nor through *kashf* any possibility of repetition of the revelation. And each revelation gives and causes the revelation to follow, and there is no possibility of receiving the two in the same way since the reception of each is a different reception, and revelation depends on receptivity. Therefore, the receptivity of the revelation offered and caused by the prior revelation is received differently and there cannot ever be repetition in revelation.

Understand with delicacy of comprehension, with depth of understanding, upon what thing is the order of being. Be cognizant of this. And praise be to the Lord of the Universes.

Of the Wisdom of Strength and Forcefulness
(*al-hikmah al-malkiyah*)
in the Word of Lot

The word *malk* means forceful (*shiddah*). Therefore, in the Word of Lot, the Wisdom of *malkiyah* would mean Wisdom appertaining to Forcefulness. A ruler (*malik*) is forceful. It is said: 'I "mastered" the dough' when you have made the dough firm (*shadadat*).

As Qais bin al-Khaṭīm described his spear thrust: 'I strengthened my hand with it and enlarged the wound to such a degree that those standing nearby could see through it to what was behind.' The Shaykh means to show by this poem the use of the word 'forcefulness' (*malkah*) which is derived from the root *mlk* from which root is also derived the words *malik* (king) and *malak* (angel), whereas in the Word of Lot it is the Wisdom of *malkiyah* (forcefulness).

Lot is qualified by the Wisdom of Forcefulness (*malkiyah*) because the Qurānic Word refers to Lot as saying: 'If only I had strength over you, or if there were for me a forceful (*shadīd*) support', and because Lot took refuge in God's strength and forcefulness. When Lot addressed his people who were disobedient and said: 'If only I had strength over you', what is meant by strength in this case is the strong and forceful spiritual will (*himmah*) which exists among the people of Effect. In other words, 'If only I had in me a strong spiritual will, I could have resisted you with it, and I could have expelled your ill from me and from my people by it, or, if I had a forceful support to take refuge in,' and by 'forceful support' he means a clan or tribe, 'so that this tribe could have removed you from me and my followers.' In the apparent meaning, the forceful support is the tribe or clan, but in reality what is meant is that since God is the Strong and the Forceful, he took refuge in Him. And the Prophet said concerning this: 'May God give mercy to my brother Lot, who indeed took refuge in a forceful support.' By this he pointed at the fact that Lot, may peace be on him, indeed was with God, because God is the Strong and the Forceful.

Lot intended resistance against the ill-doers and his enemies by the strength of spiritual will. But Lot was at the station of complete

annihilation in God (*fanâ' fi-llâh*), in which station there is no ability to dispense (*taşarruf*) spiritual will, because at that level he was completely annihilated in the Being of God, and that station is qualified by complete servanthood. Therefore his appeal meant that he would have to be translated into the station of subsistence (*baqâ'*) in God and this is the aspect of his taking refuge in a forceful support which is a tribe.

Since God by His Essence (*dhât*) is Rich beyond Need (*ghaniyy*) of the universes and since Divine actions become manifest by virtue of the places of manifestation and by virtue of the strength and forcefulness of the places of manifestation, God's action becomes manifest as strong or forceful, and God fights in those places of manifestation with fierce attack. When Lot asked for help to resist his enemies, he demanded that spiritual will (*himmah*) here which emanates from the humankind and which is specific to it, and he specified it as human spiritual will, because at the coming into being of a thing and at the annihilation of that thing, spiritual will is totally facing that thing in full presence of the collectivity of the strengths of interior (*bâṭin*) and exterior (*ẓâkir*).

Even though the angel (*malak*) is the possessor of strong strength (*malk*, strength, is derived from *malak*), some of the strengths of the manifest powers are in the state of non-being (*'adam*) in the angel, whereas the Perfect Man (*insân-i-kâmil*), who is a human being, is in the place of manifestation of the totality of the Divine Names, and he dispenses (*taşarruf*) with the strength of the totality of the Divine Names, and brings about the annihilating and bringing-into-being by his spiritual will. Here in the world this spiritual will is particular to the Perfect Man. The angel (*malak*) with regard to being a place of manifestation is lesser in degree than the Perfect Man. The angel's strength and dispensing is only to the limit of its having the places of manifestation of the Divine Names, and to the limit of the appearance of the Divine Names in it. Consequently, when the angels appeared to Lot to help him in the form of human beings, they did not destroy the enemy by spiritual will although in appearance they used dispensing (*taşarruf*).

The spiritual will which emanates from the humankind is subject to the condition of the word 'here', and is relegated to the emergence of this world, because the dispensing which happens here is particular to the Perfect Man who exists in the emergence of this world in the good image of the humankind. It is because of this that when the Perfect

Man, who is the Viceregent (*khalifah*) of God, is translated to the high spiritual isthmuses (*barâzikh*), or to the emergence of the realms of the other world, he is in the Divine Image, and the dispensing that happens in his station there devolves to the person who replaces him here. It is true that the people who have gone to the isthmuses of the other world, the people of completed (*kâmil*) spirit, are capable of dispensing with absoluteness and expansion (*inshirâh*), but they perform their dispensing through the manifested Perfect Men existing in this world, even though all the dispensings existing in the universe of witnessing (*'âlam-i-shahâdah*) belong to the Perfect Man who is existent in the universe of witnessing in the Divine Image. That is why Lot attributed the strength (*qûwah*) to himself when he said: 'If only I had the strength.' And he demanded this for his own person, and in reality this is the strength which is in the spiritual will (*himmah*) which emanates from Man. The result is that Lot became established with strength (*qûwah*) and forcefulness (*shiddah*), thereby the words that he uttered: 'If I had strength over you', became the Divine Self of the Names Strength and Forcefulness; consequently, with the strength of the spiritual will which was established through the Names Strong and Forceful, having effect over his people, destroyed them. The Prophet, may peace be on him, said that from that time there has never been a prophet who was not of the tribe he was preaching to, so that his relatives defend him against the ill of the enemies within his tribe and protect him within his tribe, exactly as Abu Tâlib, the Prophet's uncle, protected the Prophet.

The words of Lot: 'If I had the strength over you' were elicited from Lot because Lot, from the degree of closeness of supererogatory works (*nawâfil*) heard God, with true hearing, say: 'God created you from weakness', that is to say, God created you originally from that which is weak. Lot came to realize that his spiritual will had no existence in his origin, because he was created from non-existent dependency. That is why He described it as from weakness, because that which is non-existent by itself and can only receive existence from God, is a weak non-existent being. Lot referred being to the original weakness, as it has neither strength nor ability in it. But in the *Naqsh al-Fuṣūṣ* of the Shaykh, when he talks of the first weakness, he means the weakness of the constitution in the general public and the elite. And the strength that comes after is the strength of the constitution which is attached to it in the elite which is the strength given to it by the spiritual state (*hâl*). And the second weakness is the weakness of constitution, and to that

is attached the weakness of knowledge in the elite. The first weakness is of the constitution because Man is made from mud and water and each person knows this for themselves, and the second weakness is also of the constitution which is weakness of old age, which is the natural constitution. And in the weakness of the constitution, the weakness of the old man is the same as the weakness of the child.

Through the different steps of the human emergence, at each step he becomes stronger and then returns to weakness, as in old age, and finally returns to earth again. This applies to all degrees of the humankind, whether they are of the Perfection (*kamāl*) or not. The strength he has is not his own strength; it is a brought-about strength. By weakness is understood the weakness of matter, like the weakness of the child of flesh and bone. After this kind of original weakness, God developed in Man a strength which is brought about. This strength therefore is accident, and is not the strength of the origin or of his essence, and equally this strength is never perpetual. It is in everyone, no matter whether they are of the general public or of the elite. And this strength in the elite is added to the strength of spiritual state (*ḥâl*) and this strength then is called spiritual will (*ḥimmah*). When Lot said: 'If I had the strength' he meant that strength which is the strength of state (*ḥâl*) which is added on to the brought-about strength of constitution, with which people of spiritual will (*ḥimmah*) dispense with strength. During the time that he has this strength, his original weakness is not obvious, but when this is removed, Man is returned to his original weakness which eliminates the accidental strength, and he is then subject to the complete happening of his weakness.

Something which is brought-about is recent (*ḥudūth*) and something which is recent is non-existent, by virtue of it being something which is made to exist and which did not exist before. Consequently, the bringing about of weakness in Man, and its being produced, does not mean that Man was produced from non-existence and brought from non-existence because weakness does not exist there. What it means is his being returned to the original weakness and the production and manifesting of the weakness in him. But the bringing about of old age in Man is the bringing into existence and its production from non-existence because old age did not exist in Man. Consequently, according to the Shaykh, bringing about appertains to old age because old age did not previously exist in Man, but the appertenance of being brought about to weakness is the returning of Man to his original creation.

That is to say, the bringing about of weakness in Man is the returning of the man to his origin which is weakness because weakness is the quality of non-existence which exists in Man, and this is God's word: 'I created you from weakness.' In short, God returned Man to that thing from which He had created him, namely weakness. Therefore weakness is interior in the man, and accidental strength is apparent, and wherever this accidental strength is not apparent in the man, then his real state and interior, which is weakness, reappears. The weakness one is returned to is not the same weakness as at the beginning of life, although to all appearance the old man is similar to the child. But the weakness in old age is in the final degrees of weakness, which is facing towards non-existence.

To show this, the Shaykh brings another Quranic saying: 'And after that Man is brought to the lowest form of life, so that having been qualified by knowledge, he no more knows anything.' And Man is returned to his original weakness and in this the old man is similar to the child.

When Lot regarded the origin of his creation and saw the weakness of his condition of old age, and saw the weakness of knowledge appertaining to this state, which comes from God's knowledge, observing all this he realized that he had no ability for dispensing except in non-existence, and saw no strength in himself. Having been returned to the condition of weakness in the lowest degree of life in his old age, which is the station of complete annihilation in God, and annihilation in which state there is absolutely no knowledge or dispensing by spiritual will or strength, Lot saw that he had been returned to that degree and saw no power at all in himself to dispense and appealed to the Divine Strength which can only appear in the station of subsistence (*baqâ'*) in God, and which appears in the Perfect Man as dispensing with that same strength. 'There is no state nor strength except by God' (*la ḥawla wa la quwata illa bi-llâh*).

No prophet has been appointed until he has completed at least forty years of life, because after the fortieth year of life the diminishing of the human strength and the weakness of his natural constitution begins, which means that all strengths of feeling begin to diminish and the original weakness and old age begin to appear. That is why Lot said: 'If only I had the strength', meaning, 'If only I had strength to resist you'. He did not ask for the re-strengthening of his body, but demanded the effective spiritual will, because the coming about of this strength

stands aloof, because this strength is specific to God, whereas the brought-about natural strength faces towards weakness because of old age.

The reason why the prophets are appointed after forty has two aspects. One is that forty must be completed because the completion of the human emergence which is created according to the Divine Image happens in forty days according to the saying: 'God kneaded the mud of Man for forty dawns.' Each one of the powers of spirit and feeling which are in the emergence of Man is a source of Divine knowledge and the place of appearance of the inspiration from the Lord, because each power is specialized for the reception of one of the Divine knowledges. The manifestation of Complete Intellect and the acquisition of the Divine inspiration does not enter into this. The completion of the manifest and hidden powers and the perfection of the strengths happens at the level of forty. The totality of the emergence of Man with all the manifest and hidden strengths reaches his centre by the time he reaches the age of forty, and he is mature at that stage. When, at the level of the completion of forty, to whichever of his powers of feeling or intelligence or heart or soul or Divine or spiritual powers, a stroke of Divine inspiration is specifically intended to be received, the prophet receives the Divine inspiration with that. But before forty the man's emergence is not complete with all his powers.

The other aspect is that Man is coloured by the degrees of immanence and consequently is qualified by the creatural qualities and the Divine nature and spiritual power and power of light is cultivated by the qualities of humanity before the age of forty, and since he is veiled by the necessities of creaturality and of nature, his light is covered by the darkness of nature and his spirituality is dimmed by the denseness of body, just as during those years darkness is dominant in the man's hair. Consequently, in the emergence of Man before forty, the strengths which rule the person and have power over him are the creatural strengths and the darkness of the qualities of possibilities. When the man matures with all his powers at the age of forty, and becomes complete, then all his natural strengths tend towards weakness because weakness begins to set into the material body and the brilliance of the Divine Light and the rulership of the powers of the place of manifestation dominate, just as after forty, whiteness begins to dominate in the hair.

After the completion of forty, at the level of the manifestation of the Divine powers and the qualities and attributes of Lordship and the

powers of spirituality and the evidence of the Divine Reality, the Divine inspiration, and that which comes from the Lord, is received in the best of fashion and is not influenced or coloured by the domination of creatural darkness and darkness of possibilities. The Divine effusion manifests in each place of manifestation according to that place of manifestation, and is only resurrected there according to the degree of it being cleansed from the ore of existence and muddy source of existence.

Now if you ask what prevents one from the use of effective spiritual will when one knows that even the followers of the envoys and prophets possess the ability of effective spiritual will, and surely the prophets should be the most suitable in the dispensing of spiritual will, I would answer that you are right, but further knowledge is lacking in you. And the explanation of this is that indeed the knowledge of the Divinity precludes the dispensing of spiritual will; it is knowledge which prevents the dispensing through spiritual will, and according to the proportion that a gnostic's knowledge is heightened, his dispensing through spiritual will is decreased. The reason for this has two aspects. One is that usually the gnostic's reality is through his station of servanthood, in which case he will not indulge in dispensing, because he will keep in view the origin of his natural creation and because of the reality of his complete servanthood he will leave all action to the order of his Lord and will fashion himself according to his Lord. Only if there is a Divine order will he undertake to dispense in concordance with the order, because in that case he is under orders, and a person under orders is excusable; even though he knows all the time that action and dispensing belong to his Lord and are not his. Looking at himself he will see that he has no strength in himself for dispensing because he is created from weakness. So the gnostic, having seen that his reality is through his servanthood, and keeping in view the origin of his natural creation, leaves all dispensing to the Lord and makes God his attorney (*wakîl*).

The other aspect is the oneness of the man who dispenses and the man who is dispensed upon. It is the same being. And because he witnesses the singularity of the two, that is to say, because of the singularity of the vision of the eye and what is seen by the eye, he cannot see any thing from among the possibilities other than the One and Single Being of God, and it is impossible for him to convey his spiritual will on something else since he cannot observe anything else, because he is in the state of witnessing the Uniqueness of Being.

In short, that which prevents the gnostic from dispensing is the knowledge of the Uniqueness. But the complete gnostic, who is qualified by Uniqueness and who unites in himself the totality of the places of manifestation together with the realities of the Divine Names, and the qualities of the fineness of servanthood, observes with the eye of Uniqueness the plurality in oneness and the oneness in plurality. His dispensing is not through conveying his spiritual will, lest it should upset his station of servanthood. On the contrary, the dispensing which appears in his place of manifestation is the dispensing of God appearing in the place of manifestation that he is, through the actual manifestation of God Himself. But if the complete servant stops in the station of servanthood of the Ipseity, and if he then offers back to God the Lordship proffered to him, he would still not indulge in dispensing, but would rather, with exclusive servanthood, face towards God in his totality. But all the same, at the level of this total facing (*tawajjuh*) many cases of Divine dispensing become manifest in the place of manifestation that he himself is, of which he will not even be conscious. As he does not see anyone other than God he does not know on whom he can convey his spiritual will, nor does he know such a thing as an existent, other than the One, on whom he could send his spiritual will.

Therefore the gnostic, in this state of witnessing, comes to know that a person who is opposed to him does not deviate from his reality in which he was established when he was in the Presence of Knowledge at the state of the establishing of his fixed potentiality, and where in the state of non-existence he was already established according to that reality. In fact in existence, nothing which was not in the fixed potentiality (*'ayn-al-thâbita*) of the person at the state of non-existence (*'adam*) emanated from the person in opposition. The person who is in opposition did not, through his action of opposition, go contrary to his reality, and he did not transgress from his particular way of action, since the man in opposition does not manifest in existence except in accordance with the state in which he was established in non-existence (*'adam*). That is to say, the man in opposition does not transgress from his reality by being in opposition; rather he manifests with what his reality has given him.

The gnostic knows that the coming about of a thing is according to the image of the state of establishment of that thing in the Divine Knowledge, and therefore the gnostic who knows this does not attach his powers for the purpose of removing a thing to a higher state because

the reality of that thing, in the image of knowledge, is according to the straight path.

To call opposition that which manifests from a dispute is only an accidental order which is manifested by the veil which is over the eyes of the people, because everyone is, in the Divine Knowledge, the place of manifestation of the reality of one Name, and happens to be the source of one action. Even if by virtue of the opposing Names there appears to be opposition and contradiction emerging from the Presence of Being, in reality there is no opposition, because the gnostic who has risen to the Divine Knowledge knows that the person who is apparently in dispute with him is established according to the state in which he was established in the Divine Knowledge. And the gnostic is completely certain of that which the Divine Reality bestowed in the Divine Knowledge, and he does not oppose this. On the contrary, he accepts and confirms whatever bestows the reality of a thing and whatever appears from each place of manifestation.

According to this consideration, the opposition that appears from something is not opposition, and the reason why it is called opposition is consequent to an accidental order and shows the veiling from the Presence of Knowledge of the people with the veil of darkness of nature and orders of possibilities, and it is because the people are veiled from it that they are in opposition one to another. In fact, what manifests opposition is the veil of possibilities, which veils their eyes from themselves, so that they can see nothing behind the veil but see only the veil. God said: 'A great many people do not know', and this is because of the veil which is over their eyes, and this veil is not lifted and they know only the visible things of the life on earth, and they are ignorant of the other world and of the observance of the orders of Names and the higher universes that are established in the Presence of Knowledge, and their hearts are veiled and sheathed. The Shaykh says concerning the hearts which are in a sheath, that they are turned (*maqlûb*), and the word *ghâfil* (ignorant, unconscious) is an inversion (*maqlûb*) of the word *ghilâf* which means sheath, which means that their hearts are enveloped in a sheath, and this sheath prevents the heart from understanding the Divine order, and what that order was concerned with in the Divine Knowledge. Therefore the hearts of the people who are in ignorance are veiled and covered from understanding the reality of an order, and cannot comprehend anything other than what is apparent in the life of this world and can comprehend nothing of the emergence of the other world.

This knowledge, and similar things, prevent the gnostic from dispensing in the universe. And the 'similar things' point to the fact that the complete gnostic is drowned in God with his totality and by virtue of the absoluteness of his essential Reality, he is drowned in its vision and has no inclination to dominate with total spiritual will the parts of the immanent world, because with the totality of his regard he is in complete facing.

Man is not totally collected in his existence except if he faces the One and Unique God with singularity and totality and completeness and with the spiritual will that appertains to the Absolute Ipseity; in this way only he is divorced from all conditions. Therefore the gnostic does not condition himself by similar partial orders, and consequently dispensing does not occur on anything through spiritual will except by a very strong collecting of everything and by the collectivity of the heart and the regard and with complete facing, so that no other thing but that thing has a place in the heart. But if a man faces something in this manner and enters it into his heart, it is necessary for him to exclude God from his heart, and the gnostic who is completely facing is not satisfied if his heart has any space left in it for anything other than God, and would not leave God aside and face towards something else.

The Shaykh Abu 'Abdullâh Muhammad bin Qâ'id said to the Shaykh Abu Su'ûd bin al-Shibl Baghdâdi: 'Why don't you dispense?' Abu Su'ûd said to him: 'I left it to God to dispense for me in whichever way His Nature necessitates, that is to say: I made Him my Attorney and my Viceregent to dispense for me so that in the universe and in my being He dispenses as He wishes.'

Abu-l Badr al-Tema Seky al-Baghdâdi, may God's mercy be upon him, informed me that when Muhammad bin Qâ'id and Abu Su'ûd met, he said to Abu Su'ûd: 'God divided the country between me and you; why don't you dispense in it like I dispense?' Abu Su'ûd answered him: 'Oh Ibni Qâ'id, we have left it to God to dispense for us and it is according to His high words: "Take Him as your Attorney" and we have followed the order of God.' And the attorney is the dispenser.

Abu Su'ûd heard God say to His people: 'Give to others of the things over which God has made you the Viceregent.' The people addressed obviously were the 'People of Following' (*sulûk*) and the 'People of the Middle' (*awsâf*), and these people are supposed to give away to people, according to their aptitudes, who desire some of the knowledges and

gnoses that they have been given, and some they keep to themselves. At the same time, this sentence takes the people addressed as the 'People of the Ends' (*nihâyah*) who are the Viceregents who appear with the qualities of Lordship, and they are made Viceregents by God to dispense in the universe. In short, addressing them, He says: 'I have made you Viceregents in Lordship and dispensing, therefore give to Me the order (*amr*) of viceregency and Lordship and the order of dispensing and make Me your Attorney and your Viceregent, and this is better for your state; more suitable and certainly more perfect for your servanthood; and it is safer and more complete.' The greatest Viceregent and the most generous Envoy heard this address and said: 'My God, You are the Owner of Progress (*safar*) and the Viceregent in the Presences', and made God his Viceregent in the order of his own viceregency. Abu Su'ûd and other gnostics of God, each one heard this address and knew that this order concerning dispensing and gnosis, although it was in their hands, was not in reality their possession, but that in reality they were Viceregents in this order. When Abu Su'ûd heard spiritually: 'Give to others of that over which I have made you Viceregent', God addressed Abu Su'ûd's mystery, and the mystery of other people similar to him: 'This order over which I have made you Viceregent and which I have given to you; give Me your attorney in that, and take Me as your Attorney.' Consequently, Abu Su'ûd concorded with the Divine order and took God as his attorney in dispensing, because Perfect Man taking God as his Viceregent is more complete and more prevalent than God taking Perfect Man as His Viceregent. The person who observes this order can in no way dispense by spiritual will. Spiritual will is active with that collectivity when the possessor of spiritual will applies his concentration of consideration with the domination of his spiritual will for the happening of a thing, so that there is no space left in him for any other thing, and it is the knowledge of this that separates the gnostic from this collectivity. Consequently, the gnostic of complete knowledge appears with extreme impotence and weakness and does not appear by dominating anything or by dispensing spiritual will over any order.

Some of the Substitutes (*abdâl*) said to Shaykh 'Abd ar-Razzâq: 'Tell Shaykh Abu Madyan, after greetings upon him: Oh Abu Madyan, why isn't anything made difficult or tiring for us, whereas for you yourself things are difficult and tiring, and this in spite of the fact that we are trying to be close to your station and you are not trying to be close to

ours (a station you have already passed)?' At the degree of Abu Madyan the station of the Substitutes and other stations were present. Now there is no weakness or impotence in the station of the Substitutes, but in the station of Abu Madyan there is weakness and impotence.

Ibn 'Arabi adds: 'We are more complete in this station of weakness and impotence', because with higher gnosis, impotence and weakness increase, and it is because of this situation of impotence and weakness that the most perfect servant, which is the Prophet, peace be upon him, did not attribute anything of knowledge or gnosis or perfection or completion to himself, but attributed all to God, and because of that he said: 'I have no knowledge to what purpose I am used or to what purpose you are used, and I am not subject to anything other than what is inspired into me.' Thereby he relegated all action that appeared in the people and in himself to God and transcended himself completely from all action, to the point of singularizing himself out of any action that might appear in the place of his own manifestation, and left all comprehension to the consequence of Divine inspiration, thereby admitting that his knowledge is no other than Divine inspiration and Divine knowledge. And if he is inspired to dispense, he will dispense in accordance with the order, and if he is forbidden to do it, he will not. And if there is choice then he would choose not to dispense. In the matter of choice to dispense or not, if the gnostic is short of gnosis he will act with dispensing because he is not knowledgeable enough to know that to effect by dispensing is private to the Divine Presence, whereas it is contingent for the servant. At the level of servanthood, to appear with impotence is of the essence of servanthood and to appear with Lordship is a contingent order for him. To remain with matters of essence and orders of contingency is more elevated and more honourable than manifesting, and to mirror the Divine Presence is better form for the servant and more suitable. Consequently, where the servant is made Viceregent, it is the highest state of the servant to appoint God as his attorney. Therefore all the prophets always abstained from dispensing even when they had the choice, because as it is always for their good that everything is done; if the choice is given to them, it is better to abstain.

Abu Su'ūd ibn Shibl al-Baghdâdi said to his followers: 'It is now fifteen years since God gave me to dispense (*taşarruf*) and we put it in an envelope and did not use it.' Ibn 'Arabi says that these words of Abu Su'ūd are capricious on his part, and presumptuous to his Lord.

As for us, we did not abandon it in an envelope; the abandoning of dispensing is its abandoning through preference, yet, in the Presence of Lordship, the abandoning of dispensing through preference is a kind of forsaking of tact. Rather we refrained from using it, due to the completeness of our gnosis, because complete knowledge does not necessitate dispensing through the determination of choice. Whichever complete gnostic dispenses through spiritual will in the universe, he does it by order of God and obligation, and not by choice, because he knows each thing in whatever state it was established in the non-existence in the Divine Knowledge that in existence it is manifest according to that, and he does not begin to dispense. And if it becomes necessary to dispense he regards his essential servanthood and sees that total servanthood does not necessitate dispensing but rather that concordance with the Divine order is necessary. Therefore the gnostic takes the Presence of Lordship as his attorney, which is the root and beginning of the emergence of all acts of dispensing. And if dispensing happens from a gnostic in the universe, he dispenses by obligation and Divine order and not by his choice, and thus he is an appointee and is under obligation and therefore he is excusable, even perhaps he does not need an excuse because servanthood necessitates concordance with the order of the master. Thus when he dispenses through order and obligation he dispenses due to the completion of his servanthood. It so happens that many dispensings manifest from the gnostic at certain times, which the gnostic had no intention of doing either by obligation or choice, and he was not even conscious of them, and only becomes conscious of them after they have happened, and these are the Divine dispensings which happen by the manifestation of God in the place of manifestation of the complete gnostic.

We have no doubt that the station of envoyship demands dispensing for the acceptance of the envoyship. Dispensing through miracles by an envoy causes his people to acknowledge him, so that the religion of God becomes manifest. In other words, a miracle is necessary to envoyship, and the envoy, by God's permission, dispenses at the level of his people, and brings about a miracle which, at the level of his people, causes their acknowledgement, so that having acknowledged him they accept his envoyship and the religion of God becomes manifest. But a saint is not like a prophet, because the saint is the place of manifestation of the Name Interior (*bâtin*) and the station of sainthood does not demand dispensing; rather the saint prefers not to dispense.

The envoy is appointed to manifest the Divine religion, whereas the saint is to manifest God in his own being by annihilating his own being and by hiding the Divine mysteries.

In the state of envoyship, dispensing is a necessity, but the envoy all the same does not like to manifest it, but desires it in the interior (*bâtin*), because he desires to change the interior hearts of his people towards God and guide them away from being misled. Indeed the envoy has love for his people, but he does not want to stress his proofs too much because in fact excess in the manifestation of proofs results in complete destruction for his people. Therefore, because of his love for his people, the envoy makes their life preferable and does not intend excess in the manifestation of proofs which would be the cause of the destruction of his people, because the envoy knows that the more he stresses his proofs, the more obstinate some of his people will become and they will deny even more, and by denying they will be destroyed. Therefore the envoy is only an announcer. He is not excessively expressive in the manifestation of proof because if he had been excessive in proof and miracle and manifestation of invitation, the people would be equally excessive in obstinacy and denial which would cause their destruction. Thus, that which would cause their annihilation would outwardly be the excessive announcement and show of proof, but the envoy loves his people. And indeed, as with the past envoys, the envoy comes to know that the order of miracle and the excessive manifestation of proof causes destruction of peoples, he also knows that when the order of miracle is manifested to a people some of that community become believers at the level of the manifestation of that order, and some of them, although they know that order, deny it, and do not show obedience due to jealousy, pride or oppression. And some of them attach that miracle to sorcery and magic.

When the envoy sees that the people differ in their inclination to accept or deny what is brought to them, and when he sees that only if a person's heart is illumined by the light of belief does that person become a believer. And if a person has not been called with the light which is known as belief, and does not look upon the envoy with that light when the envoy has the order of miracle, that miracle does him no good, therefore the spiritual will in demanding the order of miracle becomes lessened. That is to say, the envoy's spiritual will in demanding from God the order of miracle to change his people from error into guidance becomes lessened because the effect of the order of miracle in

the hearts of the people who observe it is not general. It only affects those in whose hearts there is inclination to believe, and consequently in those hearts in which there is no light of belief the miracle remains ineffective. Only those who according to their original inclination are established in the Divine Knowledge and in the state of non-existence, receive the light of belief in their heart, and it is only those whose hearts were originally enlightened with the light of belief that are manifested in this world as people of belief. The person who in the Divine Knowledge is known as the non-believer, here will remain non-believer. That is why God said to the Prophet, who is the most knowledgeable in nature and the most faithful of state: 'You do not guide those whom you love, but God guides whom He wishes', thereby allocating guidance to belief to God alone. What remains to a prophet is as God says: 'To the Prophet is only to announce.'

Had there been universal effect concerning spiritual will then the Prophet's spiritual will would certainly have been effective, and without doubt there is no one more complete, higher or stronger in spiritual will than the Envoy, yet his spiritual will did not have any effect in bringing his uncle Abu Ṭâlib into Islam. And the verses mentioned above were brought down for that. Had the effect of spiritual will been general, certainly it would have had effect in the case of Abu Ṭâlib, who was the Prophet's uncle and protector, whom he loved and showed exaggerated attention and spiritual will to bring him into Islam.

It is because of this that God said to the Prophet: 'It is indeed for you only to announce', and He said: 'It is not for you to guide them, but God guides whom He wishes.' That is to say, you cannot guide to the Truth through your individuation (*ta'ayyun*) or by being who you are. Only God can do this by being in the place of manifestation that you represent, and He guides only those who have the inclination to be guided in the Divine Knowledge. Thus, God adds in the *Sûrat al-Qaṣaṣ*: 'God knows who will be guided.' In other words, God knows those people who, through their established essences (*a'yân-i-thâbita*) at the state of non-existence, gave to God the knowledge of their being guided. That is to say, in whichever way the picture of them being guided was drawn in the Presence of Knowledge with their immutable potentialities in their state of non-existence with their essential inclinations, they gave the knowledge of that picture to God and God knew them according to that picture, and they became known by the order of God in that image. Each of these people gave the knowledge of their

particular picture to God, and God leads them and guides them in the universe of witnessing in consequence of that knowledge. The result is that in the state of non-existence in the Presence of Knowledge, they gave to God the knowledge of the intrinsic inclination of their immutable potentialities (*a'yân thâbita*) to be guided to the Truth, and by virtue of their non-existence God knew them as such and ordered their guidance, and in the Presence of Knowledge they become the ones who will be guided.

The reality is that knowledge is subject to the known. In whichever image from among the images of knowledge the known thing is drawn, God knows it according to that image, and if the Divine Will appertains to the guidance of the known thing in the Presence of Being, that is to say, if a person in his established potentiality and in his state of non-existence is a believer, he is manifest in that image in the state of existence, and without a doubt God knew from all eternity from that person's image of knowledge that that person is inclined to be guided and to believe. That is why He said: 'God knows best who are guided.' And He also said: 'Where I am concerned, My Word never changes.' That is to say: At My level the decree (*hukm*) is not changed because My Word is according to the limit of My Knowledge of My creatures. That is to say: In My Knowledge, in whatever image one of My creatures is established, I know him only according to the limit of that image, and My Knowledge of him is to the limit of that image in My Knowledge. My Word is by virtue of My Knowledge, and My Knowledge is by virtue of what is known. I am not an oppressor to My servant, ordering them contrary to what they need. This means that I did not propose the covering of the Truth to My people and cause them to be ill-doers, and then ask from them that which is not in their scope. That is to say: I am not an oppressor who makes them into ill-doers which causes them to deny the Truth from the beginning of time, and then afterwards ask of them a belief for which they have no scope, and then blame them for that of which they are not capable. In short, We did not treat them except according to Our Knowledge, and We did not know them except by that which they offered to Us from themselves, and what they offered Us was what their original inclination was in the state of non-existence and according to which they were established. According to the knowledge which they gave Us of themselves, We prescribed that to them, and if there resulted any oppression by what they gave Us of themselves, they are the oppressors,

because We never passed an order upon them except in accordance with what they gave Us and by the decree they asked of Us according to their inclination. That is why God said: 'They are the oppressors of themselves.'

In the same way: 'We never gave them an order which was not what Our Essence gave Us to tell them', and We ordered them by it, because essences (*a'yân*) are the same as the Ipseity of Uniqueness and the Ipseity of Uniqueness is revealed in their image. Our order to them is what Our Essence gave Us to order, and Our Essence is known to Us and thereby We know whether to say to them like this or like that. In short, whatever is given to Us to order in Our Essence, We ordered according to that, and We did not say except what We know We should say. That is to say, We gave them no order other than what We knew to be established in Our Knowledge, by which We ordered them. We said: 'The Word is from Us; it is up to them to concord or not to concord with what they have heard.' This means: We said the Word is established for Us by virtue of what they gave Us to know of their inclination and their receptivity, and for them there is either concordance or lack of concordance to Our Words, that is to say, Our Order, when they have heard Our Word through what their essential inclination gives of concordance or lack of concordance.

'All is from Us and from them
And receiving is to Us and to them,
Even if they are not of Us
Doubtless We are of them.'

Which means: all order is from Us by virtue of the totality of Our Names and Our Powers of action, and at the same time the order is from them since they are the essences which are manifested by the Being of God because they are the places of manifestation by their ability to receive the realities of the Names and by their essential inclinations. The receiving of the knowledge of Reality is from Us, that is, it is from Our Divine Presence of Knowledge and the collectivity of Our Names, and also knowledge is received from the known essences. This means that no thing can reach another thing unless it is from its own essence and from its origin which is its reality. The known essences are Our Reality and Our Being, because God's Knowledge first appertains to His Ipseity and then appertains to the essences, which are the places of the manifestation of the Realities of His Essence. At

the same time, God's knowledge of the essences is God's knowledge of His Ipseity, because the essences are the same as God. And equally, that which is known is no other than God, the One Being. Thus, the receiving of the revelation and effusion (*ḥayd*) is from Us since it effuses from Our Presences of the Names, and equally the Divine effusion and Compassionate revelation is from them because the essences have manifested by individuation from the known essences.

'Even if they had not been of Us, doubtless We are of them.' This means: as the known essences are not brought about by Us, and are not of Us because God exists with the Reality of His Existence which is One Being and the known essences are non-existent and not in being, yet, as We are the exponent of the Names and as the Presence of all the Names are with Us, We are of them because the known essences individuate the Being and call God by His Names, and the Divine Names are individuated and manifested by the essences.

That is to say, in order to clarify Union (*tawḥīd*), as the known essences are not existent by a brought-about existence from Us, since they are established according to their original non-existence, and if they do not pretend that they are existent by a stroke from being, and also if the places of manifestation of some of the known essences which are the essences of existence, to which belong the perfect prophets and saints who though they are existent by the existence of God and non-existent by themselves, so as to avoid duality in existence do not pretend that they are existent by the existence of God, and submit being again to God even though being is effused from God, and take God as attorney over that, and as the known essences in the state of non-existence dwell in non-existence, with all these considerations, if they are not from Us, still without doubt We are from them, because We are individuated by them and manifest from them with perfect manifestation. In this way Union manifests in plurality, and it is not necessary that the Lord (*rabb*) is transposed into the servant (*marbūb*).

Therefore, Oh my friend, know this Wisdom of Forcefulness (*mal-kiyyah*) which is expounded in the Word of Lot according to its reality, because verily this Wisdom is the kernel of the knowledge which is the essence and summary of non-existence, because this is the place where knowledge returns to its origin, and stops at the level of sheer servanthood, where God is appointed as attorney (*wakīl*) and as Viceregent in true knowledge and gnosis and in dispensing. This is what is mentioned in this Wisdom of Forcefulness, and what is written here

is that the station of envoyship is gifted by dispensing in order to manifest the religion of God, and the envoy is appointed with dispensing because of his tenderness towards his people. However, the saintly gnostic does not dispense but makes God his attorney, and because of his knowledge of the fact that the thing comes into being according to the form it has at the state of establishment in the Divine Knowledge, again he does not dispense because he sees oneness in existence. And this is what is written here.

Consequently, become cognizant of this according to its reality and be realized in this until you are of the Divine Regents and of the heirs of Mohammed.

We have explained to you the mystery
And we have elucidated the order.

Indeed, in this Wisdom of Forcefulness without a doubt the mystery of Destiny (*qadar*) has become manifest, and the order of being has been elucidated as it is, because the order of being cannot possibly be in any other way. The actor is the effuser and the receiver is the effused.

He is indeed established in the double,
That one who is called single.

When it is said: 'He who is One Being is established in the double', it means that He is the receiving creature, and the receiving creature is the double. The double manifests in the second degree of single, and He is single because He is not the maker of double, but the single becomes double only by the reality of doubleness, and without it He remains single.

Because this chapter includes the kernels of gnosis and the mystery of Destiny (*qadar*), the Shaykh, may God be pleased with him, followed it by the chapter concerning the Wisdom of *qadar*. And God knows.



Of the Wisdom of Apportioning of Fate
(*al-ḥikmat al-qadariyyah*)
in the Word of Ezra (Ozeyr)

It is because the prophet Ezra wanted to know about the mystery of *qadar* that the explanation of his Wisdom starts with the explanation of *qadā'* and *qadar*. (This mystery which is considered as one of the most profound and insoluble mysteries, is called the mystery of '*qadā'* and *qadar*', and has two parts.)

Know that God's *qadā'* is the determination (*ḥukm*) of God in things. And His *ḥukm* in things is, according to the limits of His knowledge of, and in, things. And the knowledge of God of things is according to the limit of the knowledge that they themselves give of knowledge, from their own *nafs*, to God. This knowledge they have given to God of their *nafs* is what they were fixed upon when they were in their state of annihilation. That is to say, the *qadā'* is at the beginning of time without beginning; the Divine *ḥukm* of the *wāḥid al-aḥad* according to the knowledge the things had given God of themselves when the things were about to be individuated with the *nafs-ar-raḥmān* in the Knowledge of God. Consequently all the totality of Divine *aḥkām* are of the Uniqueness, according to the image they showed in the Divine Knowledge in the time of the *ta'ayyun*; that is, whatever the things gave of themselves to God, whether happiness or banditry or believer or hider of truth, or reaching high degrees, or of completion or lack of completion or other states (*aḥwāl*) or necessities of the time, was according to what form God knew of them then.

In short, the determination (*ḥukm*) which occurred for them at the beginning of beginningless time, according to His knowledge concerning these things is limited according to the degree of what those things gave to God of their essential inclination. In other words, the determinations (*aḥkām*), which were dormant in the *nafs* of the things themselves, gave to God that which their inclination and ability allowed, and according to which inclination and ability they were fixed in their '*ayn*, which is the limitation they imposed; and consequently it is that limited image which manifests in the Divine Knowledge. Then obviously the *ḥaqq*

knows them according to this *ḥukm* which they have given to God of their inclination, and God then gives His *ḥukm* upon the things in accordance with them. In this *ḥukm* there is no time, because this *ḥukm* is upon the things which are in non-existence, together with their *nafs*, in the Divine Knowledge, which Divine Knowledge is the same as the Ipseity of *ḥaqq*, and in this there is neither time nor place.

Now *qadar* is the timing of the same *ḥukm* without change, or decrease or augmentation of what the things were fixed upon in their *'ayn* and in their *nafs*. In other words, *qadar* is the execution in time of the order given by God concerning things about to come into manifestation according to the *ḥukm* that those things have given, shown to, and demanded of God at that time, which is without time. Again, in other words, *qadar* is the execution of the *aḥkām* according to definite causes at definite times upon the known *a'yān* without one moment of delay or haste. In other words, *qadar* is the chaptering of the *qaḍā'*. And equally it is the execution in time without augmentation or diminution of the *ḥukm* of God on things as they knew themselves in time and which they gave to the Divine Knowledge of the Ipseity.

But God did not give the *ḥukm* of *qaḍā'* upon things except through the things themselves. That is to say, in their fixity in the Divine Knowledge, in which state the things were when they desired the manifestation of their *a'yān* in their *nafs* and according to which they were fixed and according to what they gave God of themselves, in consequence to this then, God determined over them in accordance with the *ḥukm* on themselves that they had given to God. In fact the great God does not give a *ḥukm* upon any one thing or person except according to what they of themselves have given God according to their own inclination and according to the *ḥukm* of this inclination which they have given to God. So the result is that they determine over the *ḥaqq*, with which *ḥukm* the *ḥaqq* determines over them. 'And this is the *'ayn* of the mystery of *qadar* if they happen to have a heart and have deserved hearing and to this they are witnesses' (Quran), which means that the understanding of the mystery of *qadar* is peculiar to those who happen to have a heart, as we have seen in the chapter on Shu'ayb, and who are deserving of hearing and who have the witnessing of *ḥaqq* in the manifestations of immanence.

God is absolved completely on the Day of Judgement which is promised and well-known, and this absolution is established, because He did not give the order of *qaḍā'* and its execution of *qadar* and its

establishment and writing down, except by what the inclinations intrinsic in them demanded of God, through giving to God that which they themselves ordered themselves to be, by appearing in His Divine Knowledge and knowledge of forms, in forms which they chose, subject to their inclination. In short, what God has done is simply allow them to come into being and manifest themselves as they wished to be. God did not even invent the things and bring them into being. They asked to be manifested. Their inclination was not forced upon them; but it was from their ipseity. It was not given from outside but from what they had already in themselves.

Because His order upon us is according to His knowledge of us and through the necessity of His Ipseity, He knows us according to what we know ourselves as, and He never gives an order upon things with other than what the things are in their 'ayn, with which, in the state of non-existence, they were fixed. Therefore His orders are consequent to what the thing necessitates. In short, in this matter *qadā'* and *qadar* is such, that God does not call *qadā'* or assessment (*taqdīr*) upon a thing except by that which its receptivity and ability necessitates. The defendant (*maḥkūm*) asks a question from the judge according to the necessity of his ipseity and that is an order on himself, and the judge can only act upon that person through that same *ḥukm* that the defendant (*maḥkūm*) has asked for. In other words, the judge does not pass an order on anyone except by the order necessitated by the reality of that person. This means that the accused has power over the judge by what he can show to the judge, according to which the judge has to pass judgement over him. It follows that each judge is an accused by what judgement he has passed. Whoever the judge may be it is so, even if he is the *ḥaqq*, or the *khalq*, because again *ḥaqq* cannot pass an order on a thing except by that by which that thing deserves an order. And the *ḥaqq* equally falls into the same position; It cannot be judged except by that which It deserves. Consequently He is also the accused, and equally of all those who are judges in appearance, whether prophets or envoys or people of nations or kings or sultans, they are all judged by what they judge. And for these people there is also the other face, that because they are appointed by God to their positions they are doubly under orders (*aḥkām*): judging by the necessity of what they do, and being judged by what they do.

In short, verify deeply this mystery of *qadar* which is a judgement over things, and come to the knowledge of its reality, because the

mystery of *qadar* was not made unknown except by the very forcefulness of its appearance and that is why this mystery of *qadar* was not known by many. But among the prophets there have been many who wanted to know it. The fact that it is unknown by many is because the people of knowledge thought it better that it remain unknown, because its appearance is very forceful, and the forcefulness of its appearance is this: that the *anbiyâ'* who invite whole populations are veiled from knowing who from among those they invite will reach guidance and who not; and if they knew the *qadar*, they would not act as guides to everybody. Equally when a person who is ignorant of his *qaḍâ'* and *qadar*, by listening to the invitation of the envoys and prophets, may follow the envoy wherein he reaches happiness and the punishment he was to suffer is changed and he is shown great leniency, and the person who vehemently denies the prophet and does not want to hear him, exteriorizes his rebellion and receives his punishment accordingly. This is also why the prophets are not allowed to know the *qaḍâ'* and *qadar* concerning the people they invite.

Now know like this, that for envoys, God's peace be with them, there are three sides. One is the side of envoyship which is the Divine order concerning the deeds which will ameliorate the way of living and habits of the people belonging to that envoy. The envoys make known the orders with which they are burdened and the quantity peculiar and necessary to these people bear the requisite amount of *qadar* necessitated by these people, neither more nor less. The other side is the side of saints and this concerns their degree of *fanâ' fi-llâh*; that in the Qualities of the *ḥaqq* they are in *fanâ'* with the *ḥaqq* and in the Ipseity of the *ḥaqq* they are *fani* with the Ipseity. And completenesses of Divine Names and Qualities appear in them according to the degrees of their original ability and receptivity. The third side is the side of the prophets and this side is the exterior of the side of the saints, and the side of the saint is the interior of this. Yet the side of the prophets is equally to give news of God, for each according to what they have been nourished with of Divine knowledge according to their original receptivity and original inclination. The envoys again, by virtue of being an envoy, have their degrees in envoyship, according to the receptivity, inclination, beliefs and degrees of knowledge of the people to whom they are sent; and each one knows from all the knowledge of envoyship that much as necessitated by the degrees of knowledge of the people they are sent to, and neither more nor less. Nevertheless, the people are each one

more advanced in inclination and capacity of reception. Some are in a higher degree than others, and the envoys are in a higher state according to the state of their people, and there being one prophet bigger than another depends on the people. The prophet cannot propose to them something other than that which their natural inclination allows them to accept and follow, and according to the ability in the people, the degree of prophecy is higher or lower. 'Like the envoys, We have made them one superior to the other' (Quran), which means God has made one superior to the other in the envoyship. But at the same time the Quranic verse says: 'Do not differentiate between any of the envoys.' That is, in their prophethood they are the same, but by necessity of the people they are sent to, they are one higher than the other. Whereas in the case of the prophets and saints, since the prophet is the exterior of the saint and the saint is the interior of the prophet, the superiority of some of the prophets over the others is due to the fact that some are superior in sainthood than others, and not only due to the people they come to. And this superiority in the saints is by their largeness and their being the places of the exteriorization of the Divine Names and in the Presence of Being they are in *fanā'* by their own ipseity and by their own qualities in God, and consequently it is according to the degree of their *fanā'* that they are, in their appearance, some superior to others, and they do not prophesy according to the needs of the people, but rather according to the degree of their superiority in the knowledge of their interior of what they know of *ulūhiyyah* and *rubūhiyyah*. And this is not included in the kind of superiority mentioned in the Quran concerning the envoys which is dependent on the ability to receive and inclination of the people they are sent to. On the contrary, this superiority is intrinsic to their person and this superiority is due to their person and not to their function. And this superiority is again dependent on the degree of sainthood they have reached.

All this is not only physical, but partly physical and partly spiritual. God says: 'In the matter of nourishment (*rizq*), God has made some superior to others', but He has not specified this for any one kind of people, like envoys, prophets or saints, but He meant it, without condition, for everybody. And part of the nourishment is spiritual and concerns the knowledge of God, therefore among the people some are superior to others in this spiritual way. But He did not bring the nourishment except according to the *qadar* known to Him of the deservings that were asked of Him by the creatures. This apportioning

is according to the inclination of the '*ayn-i-thâbita* of that thing as the resultant of what that thing needs of necessity according to its inclination as determination (*ḥukm*); so it is the *ḥukm* which has been the *qaḍâ'* which apportions his desert (*qadar*). In other words, in the origin of the *ḥukm* which takes place in the degree of *qaḍâ'*, when they give of themselves their limitation to God, and demand their manifestation, at that point their nourishment is given in full according to the limit of their demand; and it is given all at once. But later when these things enter the Presence of Being, both the nourishment which is spiritual and that which is not is given to them in proportion to quantities, which means that although the determination has taken place for the full measure of what they demanded, in life they receive according to and in consequence of their *mashî'a*. As we have seen, God limits His own knowledge of them to what they give Him of their *nafs*. The knowledge of the *mashî'a* is in the same way; it is what their *mashî'a* gives to God that God consequently knows of their *mashî'a*. Therefore He apportions to them now in degrees what has been decreed before in total. Because things according to their *a'yân* at the moment of their demand, not only limit God to the limit of their demand, but also to the limit of matters of *irâdah* and *mashî'a* in consequence of their *a'yân-i-thâbita*. In fact it is the prerogative of the *a'yân* to limit a mode of the *a'yân* or an inclination of the *a'yân* to a determined time as this is the essential prerequisite of the *a'yân*. It is that *qadar* and *qaḍâ'* is subject to the *mashî'a* and *irâdah* and *mashî'a* is subject to the Divine Knowledge and the Divine Knowledge is subject to the known mystery of *qadar* and *qaḍâ'*.

Now know that the knowledge of the mystery of *qadar* and *qaḍâ'* is of the most important and one of the greatest from among the knowledges; and God does not teach or let people know of it except to a person whom He has specified for complete knowledge, so that he knows the *ḥaqq* and becomes an '*ârif*' with complete knowledge. The knowledge of this mystery of *qadar* and *qaḍâ'* gives total repose to the person who knows it, equally gives the worst suffering. Now, that it gives complete repose to the knower of this mystery is obvious, because he now knows and is '*ârif*' of the fact that that thing will not happen to him unless his own '*ayn-i-thâbita* has given to God of his demands at the level of Divine knowledge and what he receives is what he asked for and that God has assessed him at the time he did that, and the *qadar* was decreed then and what his reality asked for and received will

not vary ever or change, therefore he knows now that he will not receive anything except what he has asked for except according to his eternal inclination, and this gives pleasure. All development and completion has been deserved by his reality, and all suffering whether sensible or spiritual will be definitely received by him according to what he has asked of God. He knows that it has already been accorded in totality, and his *nafs* is secure in the knowledge that he is going to receive it. On the other hand, that the knowledge of this mystery gives to the knower the deepest suffering is because he observes in others the completion of all possibilities and that they receive it according to their ability, inclination and reality, and that it is in consequence to their essential aptitude; and that he himself is short in servanthood, and in being the place of complete manifestation, therefore he feels pained in considering the shortness of his inclination even though he knows he must be beyond and in better and closer satisfaction of the *ḥaqq* than the one who is completely veiled from the mystery of *qadar* and *qaḍâ'*. There is a second face to this. It so happens that the time arrives when he is ordered to do a thing, and that in his inclination there is no provision for the execution of that order. In short then, the knowledge of this mystery of *qadar* and *qaḍâ'* gives to its knower both repose and suffering. And because the knowledge of this mystery of *qadar* and *qaḍâ'* gives both these conditions, the great *ḥaqq* has qualified His own *nafs* both with anger and with approval, and because of this the Divine Names became in opposition. And this is the mystery that both Divine anger and approval appertain to the mystery of the knowledge of *qaḍâ'* and *qadar*.

Anger (*ghaḍab*) is of the order of non-existence and is contingent to the non-ability or non-receptivity of a thing of completion and of happiness, or is dependent upon a shortcoming in the person's inclination. Consequently, Divine anger is due either to lack of ability or to shortage of ability, because that Divine *ḥukm* which has to do with the *ghaḍab* is subject to the Divine Knowledge and knowledge is also subject to what is known and what is known also confers the non-ability and anger, and God then knows that that person or thing deserves anger. Therefore, *ghaḍab* is from the order of the knowledge of the mystery of *qadar* and *qaḍâ'*. The relationship of the mystery of the Divine approval to the mystery of *qadar* and *qaḍâ'* is as follows: approval is subject to complete inclination which necessitates the reception of *rahmah*, and if a thing is receptive of *rahmah* and effusion

(*fayḍ*) and benevolence (*ināyah*) and deserving of happiness and completion, and since all this is dependent on knowledge, inclination, state and character, then God knows that person according to his inclination and receptivity and Divine approval faces towards him. Consequently, Divine approval also is in the order of the knowledge of *qadar* and *qaḍā'*, and in consequence of a thing's ability and non-ability God has qualified His own Self with approval and anger. And at the Presence of Oneness due to the knowledge of the mystery of *qadar* and *qaḍā'*, the Divine Names have become in opposition, because the Divine Names are in the Presence of Knowledge, individuated because of the *a'yân*. And some of the *a'yân* by their inclination and their receptivity to manifestation are completely receptive to human Divine completions and require from the source of the effusion of being, the Beautiful Names like *laṭîf*, *jamil*, *mun'im*, *hâdi*, and are places of manifestation for these, and equally in the Presences of being and *shuhûd* the Beautiful Names are manifested in the best of manifestations in these, and manifest, in this world and the other, all the *aḥkâm* and effects which are in the treasuries of their treasures. And the effusion of these Names and their revelation is constantly and always upon these receptive *a'yân* and these receptive places of manifestation. On the other hand, some of the *a'yân*, due to their original lack of ability, demand the *jalâl* Names of *qahhâr*, *jalil*, *muntaqim* (Avenger) and *muḍill* etc. which being in the Presence of Knowledge and secondly in the Presence of Being, by virtue of their lack of ability the *ḥukm* of these Names and their equivalents are in them in their ability and strength which are requisites of their effects of Lordship, and consequently in this world and the other these Names never cease to manifest. In short, the mystery of *qadar* and *qaḍā'*, which is one reality, exercises its imperative both in the absolute being and in the relative being, and it is not possible that anything of it should ever be left out. And the mystery of this mystery is that the realities of knowledge and the *a'yân-i-thâbita* are the images of the knowledges of *ḥaqq* from ever. And the knowledges of *ḥaqq* are not additional to the Ipseity, or outside of the Ipseity of the *ḥaqq*, but on the contrary, it is the same and original to the Ipseity. In His own Knowledge the Ipseity by revealing Itself to Its own Ipseity in the forms of Its Qualities has rendered the Ipseity relative. In other words, the Names of the Ipseity or the Names of the *a'yân* or the letters of the *ghayb* which are, in the Ipseity of the *ḥaqq*, the same as that Ipseity and the Divine knowledges cannot be other than Its own

realities, because they are the realities of the Ipseity and the Ipseity of the *ḥaqq* does not accept any variation or addition or augmentation or diminution. Just like a half, a third, a quarter are intelligible in the reality of the one, these are, for that one, original relativities enclosed in its oneness and not outside of it. It is not really these relativities, intelligible in the reality of oneness, that are manifested; but when the one manifests, all these relativities manifest that oneness in the endless possibilities of their relationships, according to their ability, and the manifestation of the One Being of the *ḥaqq* in the images of many is exactly like this.

The prophets did not receive the inspiration except through the direct and private way which is, with the agency of the angel, information coming directly from the *ḥaqq*. At that level the envoys and prophets are not concerned with, or required to know, or are aware of other knowledge than that which is imparted to them through this method. Because it is the degree of being an envoy or prophet which presumes the giving up of all other mental or intellectual or philosophical considerations. They are imbued with a taste for the reception of this information and have no taste for any other, and because of their envoyship and prophethood, they are equally cut away from the images of the knowledges which were established in the state of non-existence of the knowledge of the *a'yân* and consequently from the taste of knowing about the mystery of *qadar* and *qadâ'*. They are completely specified for only that which appertains to their prophethood and envoyship. If when it is necessary for one of them to know the mystery of *qadar* and *qadâ'*, then they come to know this not through their prophethood and envoyship, but through their sainthood, at which degree, in any case, prophethood and envoyship are annihilated. Therefore the complete knowledge (*'ilm*) is only through Divine revelation and by the lifting of the veil of the eye and the ear like at the time of the Last Judgement, which in this world is *kashf*, and the *ṣâhib-i-kashf* (owner of *kashf*) who combines in one the light of vision with the light of the eye, if his *kashf* makes him comprehend a thing by one of these he also does it by the other. When the *ḥaqq* reveals through the light of the *kashf*, the *'ârif* observes the realities as they are in the Presence of the knowledge of *a'yân* and realities, and understands what is ancient, what is subsequent, what is non-existent, what is in being, and what is necessary and what is allowable.

Now understand like this, that the great *ḥaqq* does not pass a

judgement (*ḥukm*) with a *ḥâl* or an action or qualification over a thing except in accordance with that thing's necessitated original reality as individuated in the eternal Knowledge, because His *amr* is one, and diffuses and spreads upon the receptive possibilities His own One Being, and manifests what is in effect in each receptive '*ayn*, and that receptive '*ayn* manifests itself with that and manifests that. Ozeyr, may peace be on him, by necessity of the *aḥkâm* and the position he was in in his land, required his predilection to the knowledge of this mystery, and in several different ways the orders of *qadar* and *qaḍâ'* were shown to him; which orders are subject to knowledge and knowledge is subject to the known. But Ozeyr demanded this knowledge of the mystery of *qadar* and *qaḍâ'* through the method of inspiration like the prophets and envoys use, which is not the usual way of arriving at this mystery. Because of this he was admonished for his demand, and God said to him: 'If you do not end this question, We shall obliterate your name from the company of prophets' (*la-inn lam tantahi la amḥunâ ismaka min diwâni an-nubûwah*). The knowledge of this mystery cannot be given by the way of inspiration, because Divine inspiration requires envoyship and prophethood, and they require invitation of the people, and the invitation of the people is opposed to the knowledge of the mystery of *qadar* and *qaḍâ'*. Now, the envoys are veiled from this mystery during their envoyship and Ozeyr was a prophet under orders to invite people, and consequently he was admonished, because he asked for that which was not given to him. Had Ozeyr asked, like we have said, for the removal of the veils which covered the eye and vision so that he could see the mystery he wanted, he perhaps would not have had the admonition, because even when one does not know if a certain knowledge is in one's '*ayn*, and one demands something against one's '*ayn*, yet if one asks for the veils of the eyes and vision to be removed, one may not be scolded. But the knowledge of this mystery is at the level of the Divine intelligence where it concerns the *a'yân* at the state of non-existence, and this cannot be shown. And these are knowledges private to the level of the private Divine knowledges, and they are kept only for those people that God chooses to know at His own level. And Ozeyr was not given this knowledge, yet the other knowledge that he asked — how do the dead come alive again? -- was in the order of the question of Abraham*, not a question due to doubt, but rather a visual verification of accepted truth. And that was answered to him, and shown to him in himself by making him die for a hundred years and

making him come to life again, and to see how the time-whitened bones were again re-covered by flesh and skin and then brought to life. (*Abraham wanted to see with his eyes how the dead came alive again. He was told to take four little birds and cut their heads off and make a well-mixed paste with their bodies, feather, bone and all, and place a portion of the paste on the summits of the four mountains which surrounded the area. Then he was to place the four heads each one between the fingers of his hand and call for the birds. He saw that the four birds were reconstituted and joined to their heads in the hand of Abraham.)

The knowledge of one person's *qadar* and *qaḍā'* does not entail the knowledge of all people's *qadar* and *qaḍā'*; had he been shown again like he was shown how the dead come to life, still he would not have known what is the knowledge of the *qadar* and *qaḍā'* for his people, since the knowledge of this mystery is at the level of the Ipseity before *ta'ayyun*, therefore it is not revealed to people and is specifically cut off from the prophets and envoys; and Ozeyr's question was of *qadar* but the knowledge of the *qadar* was not given to him, because in relation to Ozeyr this knowledge was absolutely impossible to give, since the conditioned is prevented from circumscribing the absolute. But that which was a question of the conditioned, God did show him in his own person. And it is impossible for anyone other than God to know the order of *qaḍā'*, therefore the keys of that which is established of the *a'yân* in the non-existence are the keys of the *ghayb* (*mafâtiḥ-ul-ghayb*) and nobody but God may know these, and the knowledge of *qadar* is only possible by reaching that which is fixed for the *a'yân* in the non-existence, and since this is not possible for anyone else the knowledge of such things is also not possible; 'The keys of the Unknown are with Him and nobody else knows them' (*wa 'indahū mafâtiḥ-ul-ghayb, la ya'lamuha illa huwa*). And we must recall that the Names which are contained in the *ghayb* reveal themselves due to the enlargement of the *nafs-ar-raḥmân* in the non-existent *a'yân*, and the non-existent *a'yân* become then the keys for these Names. Equally the Ipseity of the *ḥaqq* is a Divine Name by each *'ayn*, and each Name is a key for the treasury of the unknown which is in the Ipseity of the *ḥaqq*. And the totality of these keys are in the hands of God, because all the Names which are collected at the degree of Divinity are included in the Name God which is the Name of this degree. But it so happens that the great God by virtue of the *mashî'a* of one of His servants, who have to do with

certain *amrs*, specifies them for His Presence of Knowledge and makes them know. And this way of bringing God knowledge depends on *mashî'a* and *mashî'a* of this kind is subject to *ḥaqq's* knowledge and the knowledge of that thing is subject to what is known. And that known thing's inclination in the Presence of Knowledge allows some of the *a'yân* in the Presence of Knowledge to face only towards God in totality and annihilates his own ipseity in the Ipseity of God. The servants who are allowed to know these things are few and most of the servants do not even know who these servants are, except the Perfect Man who is absolved from conditions, and who is qualified by witness, and witnessed of oneness. In his totality of *'ayn*, the totality of all the *a'yân* are included, and the *ism-i-â'zam*, which is the collection of all the Divine Names, is included in his name, and his *ḥukm* is completely different from the *ḥukm* of some of the servants who are made to know certain *amrs*.

Now, let it be known to you like this, that in fact the honour is such that the *a'yân*, which are the keys, are not called keys except in the state of opening, and the state of opening is the relationship of the immanence to the non-existent things, and this is because of the approaching of the Divine revelation of the Ipseity to the non-existent things, which cause them to become immanenced. And at the level of the coming into being of immanence the non-existent things become the keys for the Divine Names and the Names become keys for the non-existent things, because the opening up of the non-existent things from their non-existence, and their being immanenced, is through the action of the Divine Names. Consequently, that state of opening is no other than the coming into manifestation of the things which are in the treasuries of the *ghayb*. And there is no manifestation except by the immanencing of the *a'yân*. And this state is exactly the relationship of *qudrah* to the *maqḍûr* (the acted-upon), or if you want you can say the relationship of the Divine *qudrah* to the coming into being of the thing which receives its portion (*maqḍûr*). This state is such that in the state of relationship of immanencing to the things, and the relationship of the *qudrah* to the *maqḍûr*, in these states there is no pleasure whatsoever for any one person, except God Himself, because He is not relative, and what is other than Him is relative, and what is relative is incapacitated. The action is *qudrah* which is absolute and therefore cannot manifest from that which is not absolute. In that state there is no *kashf* through revelation for anyone, because *qudrah* and action is

not established for anybody else, but is private to God, since we know that the quality of Absolute Being, which is not relative to anything at all, is private and fixed for God. Again, because He alone is the Absolute Being, in bringing about being absolute, *qudrah* appertains specifically and privately to the Absolute Being, since that which is other than absolute is relative and all that is relative is receptive and effected.

Now, it does happen, that some of the Completes have the ability to bring into being and to return to non-being, which happens in certain cases and this is referred to certain *a'yân*. To be qualified with such *qudrah* is not by virtue of any difference between the *kâmil* and the *ḥaqq*, but on the contrary, perhaps, rather by virtue of the union consequent to the side of servanthood having found *fanâ'* in the side of Lordship, or by virtue of that which is necessitated by the total of absoluteness in the quality of the *kâmil*, exactly as in the case where God said to the tongue of Jesus to say: 'I will make the blind see, and will cure the leper and will bring to life the dead, by God's permission.' Again, in this absoluteification, there is no *dhawq* for the relative person, except for such a person as would be completely freed from his relativity into absoluteness and be empty of himself during the execution of the act and be not himself present and in observation and in execution during the bringing into being. And these people, may God be pleased with them, are the Seals of perfection.

While we saw that God was displeased and scolded Ozeyr, may peace be on him, concerning his question concerning *qadar*, now we have seen that in fact Ozeyr wanted to know the relationship of the *qudrah* to the *maqdûr*, and desired the witnessing of this through *dhawq*; but the relationship of the *qudrah* to the *maqdûr* witnessed through *dhawq* is impossible except by the ipseity of such a *qâdir* who alone may observe his own uniqueness in the *maqdûr* by virtue of the manifestation of the *qâdir* in the image of the *maqdûr*, so that the quality of duality in the *qâdir* and *maqdûr* may not be eliminated by the uniqueness of the ipseity. Bringing into being and invention of creation is a Divine speciality of *qudrah*. This is because the *qudrah* which is related to the *maqdûr* is not necessitated by the ipseity of anything except for one such for whom absolute being is fixed, for one such cannot be conditioned, either by the quality of *qâdir* alone, or by the quality of being *maqdûr* alone. Equally he must not be only *ḥaqq* or only *khalq* but rather he must be in a position to observe the uniqueness of *qâdir* and *maqdûr* together, and this witnessing is specifically fixed to the

privateness of God, whereas Ozeyr's request was the request of *qudrah* for bringing into being so that he could witness the state of the *qudrah*'s relationship to the *maqdûr*, whereas the quality of bringing into being and 'invention' is private to the *ḥaqq*, and is the *qudrah* of the Divine Reality, and the admonishment was because of this. Had Ozeyr, instead of asking for *qudrah* from the Divine Reality, asked for *kashf* and realization, it is possible that there would have happened no admonition, because, as has been said before, the knowledge of *qudrah* is not forbidden through the way of *kashf* and knowledge, because *kashf* happens from the Presence of Knowledge through revelation. It does happen that certain things are *qudrahtized*, and this is witnessed by certain people, the observance of which is related to the Divine *mashî'a*, but knowing of absoluteness is absolutely impossible for the creation ever by virtue of the fact that it is the *khalq*. But if a person is completely and totally in *fanâ'* and there is nothing left in him of his individuality and 'I'-ness and he is annihilated totally in the *ḥaqq*, he alone can know *ḥaqq* by virtue of the fact that he is *ḥaqq*, and this point of arrival is particular to the owner of the most complete aptitude. But Ozeyr, peace be on him, had asked to taste of something whose existence could not be in creation, because how-ness cannot be understood except by taste, consequently how *qudrah* relates to *maqdûr* cannot be understood except by *dhawq*, and creation has no taste in this because how-nesses are consciousnesses, and Ozeyr asked for something which did not exist in the creature.

The admonition to Ozeyr then, was that if he insisted in this question, the way of informing him through Divine inspiration would have to be removed from him. But this way of receiving by Divine inspiration is the way of the envoys and prophets. The other way of revealing is through Divine revelation. But the revelation on this matter can only come to you through *dhawq* if it is in your original inclination to receive comprehension through *dhawq*. If you reach your original inclination, you will only find that which you are at now, i.e. being a prophet, cannot support this form of revelation. Equally, you will find out, having reached your '*ayn*, that what you wanted to know is of the particularities of Divine Ipseity. Then you would come to the conclusion, since God gives to each according to his nature, that it is not in your nature to receive an answer to such a question, and you would of your own accord give up such a question, and you would not need God to tell you that you should not ask such a question. Which means, in

short, that if Divine inspiration and information through inspiration was removed from Ozeyr, then *amrs* would be made known to him through *kashf* and revelation which would lead him to know his own '*ayn thâbita*, and having seen his '*ayn thâbita* he would then know that as there is no possibility for him to reach the knowledge of the mystery of *qadar* in his '*ayn thâbita*, he cannot know this, because this knowledge is a Divine particularity which necessitates the knowledge of reality of the totality of the *a'yân*.

The Prophet Mohammed, peace be on him, said: 'My Lord admonished me with the best of admonishments', and this information proves that the admonishment of Ozeyr rather was munificence on the part of God to Ozeyr, and those who are *ahli-kashf* and knowers of this kind are knowers, and people of ignorance and denial do not know this, because the ignorant preserve the outward *amr* by their understanding of its outward limitation, and remove from it the reality of the *amr*, and this information to Ozeyr was in reality a promise and not that which is promised. In short, those who know, know that this information is a promise, because they know that though in appearance this news concerning Ozeyr's admonishment seems to promise his removal from prophecy and Divine inspiration and his removal from the Presence of closeness, in fact, on the contrary, this cannot be so because the prophets have power and height further than this situation, because the private and personal inclination of the prophets confer on them the fact that their names are fixed in the company of prophets and that they are preserved there with complete Divine purity, and that they cannot be displaced from there.

Know this then, you, that in fact sainthood (*wilâyah*) is a Divine Quality and the circle of universes is the collectivity of everything and includes all the degrees of envoys, prophets and saints, and refers specifically to the origination of the other world and totally to the origination of this world, and as sainthood is the enclosing circle of all, it cannot be cut off. And because prophethood has been cut off by the last prophet, peace be on him, the collectivity has in it a prophethood reserved for the saint. Even to this day, this is not cut off, because it is related to the saints who are not of the people who, like the envoys and prophets, make new doctrines and religions. But this cutting off is particular to the source of prophethood and relative to it but continues by virtue of sainthood which is necessarily the dissemination of knowledge concerning God and by direct and integral giving of information.

The source of sainthood is equally particular because giving out of Divine knowledge which is *tawhîd* of the Ipseity and *tawhîd* of Names and Qualities is specifically the informing of those who are inclined to receive by those who are knowers of God. But the relationship of sainthood to the complete servant is no other than the degree of the *fanâ'* in God of the servant, wherein he is by his own *nafs* in *fanâ'* and destruction and his being is circumscribed by the Being of the *haqq* who circumscribes all things that exist, and God is the director over him, and this is the cause of sainthood never ending, because that thing we have just mentioned cannot possibly end, whereas the prophethood of indoctrination and the prophethood of envoyship were all cut off and they were cut off with the last prophet, Mohammed, who actually said: '*la nabiyy ba'dî*'—'No prophet after me', which means that no one is sent after Mohammed with a new religion and doctrine, like Moses, like Jesus, like Mohammed were. And there is not even a prophet to whom a new religion has been revealed, and there is not even a prophet who appears with a new doctrine which has been taught to a new prophet like the prophets to the people of Israel who are according to the doctrine of Moses. Nor is there one who has a new doctrine of his own, nor one who has been taught by *haqq* to whom *haqq* has taught special doctrines. Equally there are no new envoys since envoys are taught by new doctrines to which they call the people. In short, there is no new envoy. But that both Khidr and Elijah, upon both of whom be *salâm*, exist after the last prophet, and the coming again of Jesus after Mohammed, are all through the consideration of sainthood (*wilâyah*), and not as prophet or envoy, there being left no other degree, then, except that of sainthood. The saint does not assume the name of saint by the perfection of his servanthood so as not to equalize himself with the owner of that Quality, God, one of whose Names is *waliyy*. Because if the man called himself *waliyy*, the taste of servanthood would be lost. Whereas the appellations of prophet and envoy are not Divine Qualities, but they are the most perfect servants; not even in appellation do they assume the Divine Name of *waliyy*, because the names of envoy and prophet are names of *khalq*, therefore they are in perfect servanthood, and they are names applied to the people who are individuated in that degree, whereas with the Name *waliyy*, God has called Himself and qualified Himself with the Quality that this Name contains. This Name *waliyy* remains, and is prevalent over God's servants in this and the other world, and no name is left

by which a servant might be called, and which might be specific to the servant without at the same time being in reference to *ḥaqq*. Consequently, the servants are obliged to be called *awliyā'* by virtue of the fact that they are *fanī* in God. This only remains, that God is full of benevolence (*luṭf* or *laṭīf*) to His servants.

You may observe that a prophet sometimes talks of things which have nothing to do with religion, like: 'If My servant approaches Me with supererogatory works, I become his hearing and his eye' (*idh taqarraba ilayya 'abdi bil-nawāfil kuntu sam'ahu wa baṣarahu*), or: 'You did not throw when you threw, but God threw' (*wa mā ramayta idh ramayta wa lākin Allāhu ramā*). Such *aḥādīth* and such things that have to do with being characterized with the character of God and stating of complete giving up to Him (*tawakkul*), and agreement to God (*ridā'*) and surrender (*taslīm*), and such stations of *tawḥīd* or individuation and *fanā'* and *baqā'* and totalling and differentiating and other characters and stations of God; to explain these, if the prophet speaks of things which have nothing to do with dogma, it is because he is at the same time a saint who knows, because for the prophet there are three degrees. One is the degree of envoyship where he is a connection between God and peoples; the second is the degree of sainthood, which is a connection between a prophet and the *ḥaqq*, and in this degree there is no other connection, where reception here is done directly without intermediary. So if the prophet speaks from his secret sainthood from such knowledges as knowledge of oneness which have nothing to do with doctrine and religion, he speaks as a *waliyy* and *'arif*, because such things refer to the *ḥaqq* and do not refer to the *khalq* for which latter he uses the tongue of prophethood or envoyship. And the prophet's station of knowledge of sainthood is more complete and higher than his condition of being a prophet and an envoy, because sainthood is from the side of *ḥaqq* and is never cut off, whereas envoyship and prophethood are from the side of *khalq* and are cut off. And if you ever hear that the degree of *wilāyah* is higher than the degree of prophethood, understand and be certain that what is meant is like when we say that prophethood, envoyship and sainthood degrees are collected in one person. Understand this so, because what is meant is that in that person, sainthood is higher than the others, but it is not meant that the saint who follows in the *sharī'ah* of the prophet is higher than the prophet, because the dependent cannot be higher than that on which he depends; if that were so he would be equal to it or pass beyond it which is impossible. When

the prophet and envoy have finished with their prophethood and envoyship, their place of return is sainthood and knowledge of God which is that side which appertains to God, therefore when they are removed from this world they remain as saints, because though the other two finish, *wilâyah* never finishes, and they return to receiving knowledge and *ma'ârif* in the isthmuses of the other world and isthmuses of spirituality through their sainthood, and they receive this Divine knowledge through their knowledge of *kashf* and revelation, and what is meant in this of knowledge is not the information received by the agency of an angel but the knowledge which is received from the observation of Divine knowledge without intermediary by a special way, which results from the witnessing of the witnessing of Ipseity, which is the real Divine knowledge.

Do you not see that God who ordered the Prophet to ask for more in knowledge did not order him to ask for more other than knowledge, and He said: 'Say: Lord increase me knowledgewise' (*wa qul rabb zadni 'ilman*), and he was at the time an envoy and a prophet and He did not order him to ask for more either in prophethood or envoyship, because any increase in envoyship or prophethood is dependent on the people who listen to him, and when the completion which is particular to the people is manifest there can be no question of an increase in envoyship or prophethood since their inclination has reached its limit. What has happened to them is the sealing of prophecy and sainthood. And since a certain condition is subject to a limitation and a cutting-away, there can be no demand of an increase in it. But the order to ask for more knowledge despite any other Quality which qualifies God is because there is no end to the Divine revelation and that there is no repetition in the Divine revelation and since there is no end to Divine revelation there is no limit to Divine knowledge, because each level of revelation requires the appertaining knowledge. There can be no possibility of an end to *wilâyah*, because *wilâyah* is one of His Names. If there were an end to *wilâyah* then one of His Names would be cut off from Him. But the reality is that the Name *waliyy* is a Name in *baqâ'*, subsistence, as He says of Himself: 'In fact God is *waliyy* and *hamîd*' (*inna Allâhu huwa al-waliyy al-ḥamîd*). Equally, as Joseph said: 'You are my *waliyy* in this world and in the other' (*anta waliyyi fi dunyâ wa-l âkhirah*). The Name *waliyy* is specifically and particularly for the servant by his creatureship, by his reality and by his relationship, by virtue of the fact that the servant is characterized by the character of

God in his state of *fanâ'*, by virtue of their reality being of the Divine Ipseity and in the degrees of Divine Qualifications they are effected by it, and by virtue of the fact that the servants in their *fanâ'* and in their state of *baqâ'* after *fanâ'* relate both ways to Him and this is the degree of closeness by obligations and is a station of being an heir. So the Name *waliyy* applies to anybody who is individuated in one of these three degrees. When God said what He said to Ozeyr, this was the promise, that having removed him from the list of prophets and envoys he would then be subject to the *kashf* and Divine revelation, because there would remain in Ozeyr with the finishing of envoyship and prophethood, his sainthood.

Since there is no prophet or envoy who is not a saint, it is necessary to be a saint to become a prophet or envoy, and what this promise was, was that your added-on-degree of prophethood will be removed from you if you insist on understanding this mystery, and you will remain as saint. And a prophet and envoy cannot be sent somewhere as envoy except after having gone through the purification and satisfaction caused by the necessities of becoming a saint and being the subject of Divine Love. But his saintship is his side towards God whereas his envoyship and prophethood is towards the people. Consequently, prophethood and envoyship are particular degrees within the realm of sainthood, but not all saints need be prophets or envoys. Therefore sainthood is more common than prophethood and envoyship, which makes of prophethood and envoyship two special degrees in sainthood. And when through revelation the mystery of *qadar* is made revealed to them (*munkashif*) the station of sainthood is strengthened and in that the stations of prophethood and envoyship are annihilated. Therefore it is definitely true that Ozeyr's question was acceptable, because as a prophet he was also a saint and a special saint and therefore in knowledge of the realities of God. Therefore God would not provoke in him what he sees unfit, or cause him to ask that which is impossible to bring about. Therefore a prophet asks only that which is possible to happen. Consequently his question is always well received. Therefore it is obvious that Ozeyr's question was an acceptable question and God's apparent admonition was a promise because what he wanted would happen when his prophethood and envoyship would be removed from him.

Yet although we said that there is no invitation to a new creed or new belief in the other world and it is all ended with the last of the

envoys, there is one exceptional case. This case concerns the infants, little children and mad people. The other world is the place of reckoning. At its beginning people are divided into groups according to their acts and their ability to receive the invitation made to them in this world by either inviting to a religion or to a way of thought which would lead them to belief and surrender in God. As these children, infants and mad people could not have received invitation and thereby shown responsible action either one way or the other, they can be neither recompensed nor considered blameworthy. Those people who are destined to punishment are so destined because of their action in this world; conversely, those destined to recompense are so destined again by that action, but the infant, child, or mad person cannot be held responsible for any action, with the result that they can be neither punished, nor recompensed. To do one or the other would be injustice, and Justice is one of the Divine Names; even to let them out of the punishable or recompensable category would be injustice. Therefore, in the case of these three categories, infant, child or mad, who have died before their reaching the age or the state of responsibility, a special case of invitation to a creed or dogma or belief will be proposed. From among the known or unknown prophets or envoys one will be selected and he will have as his emblem a fire. He will propose to these three to believe in him and in what he says, and to enter the fire. Those who will believe in him and follow him into the fire therein will find coolness and pleasure and satisfaction; those who will not, will suffer punishment. Which means that the members of these three categories will be given in the other world, reason, intelligence and judgement, by which they will make their choice, just like all humankind has been able to do. This much of religion and invitation will be left for after the Day of Judgement before allocation to punishment or pleasure, or fire or paradise, so that there be no one left in that place who has not had the opportunity to deserve one or the other, and therefore this much of invitation has been left over before entrance into one or other of the states, and this we wanted to note here, and show which kind of invitation would be left for the other world after all kind of invitation has been ended in this world, and praise be to God.

The Wisdom of Elevation
(*al-ḥikmat an-nubûwiyyah*)
in the Word of Jesus

**From the water of Mary or from the blowing of Gabriel,
In the image of Man existent from mud,
The Spirit immanenced in the person which is cleansed
From nature, which you name by 'prison' (*sifn*).
Due to this his abiding was lengthened,
Therein more than a thousand years appointed,
Spirit from God and no other, and because of that
He revived the dead and built a bird from mud
So that it be true for him that his origin is from his Lord
And by it have effect in the high and in the low.
God cleansed him bodily and transcendentally,
Spiritually, and made him the symbol of His immanencing.**

**From the water of Mary or from the blowing of Gabriel,
In the image of Man existent from mud**

Now let it be known like this, the human bodies even though they are one in the limits of reality and the images of the senses and spirituality, yet the causes of their composition are varied, so that the one who is weak of mind need not imagine that the Divine Ability and Reality does not bestow by which this human emergence is immanenced except through one cause which by itself bestows this emergence. Thus, God the High denies this doubt, and He created the human bodies according to four varieties. One of these is the body of Adam, another is the body of Eve. Yet another is the body of Jesus, and the other is the bodies of the sons of Man. Each of these four kinds of bodies are in opposition in the emergence of their bodies to the causes of another emergence. Yet, they are not in opposition in the bodily and spiritual images and in the reality of Man. Thus God the High manifested in one special way this emergence of Man in Adam by which He did not manifest the

body of Eve, and manifested the body of Eve in such a way that He did not manifest by it the body of Jesus, and He manifested in such a way the bodies of the sons of Man by which He did not manifest the body of Jesus. All of these mentioned bodies are called Man in reality. Thus, the creation of the bodies of Man is not due to one relationship, but it is rather that it is an order which appertains to the Ability of God the High, and to the Will of the Independent Actor, and He creates without any fault or condition, just as His *mashī'a* requires and what His Wisdom bestows. 'Indeed God is the Knower of everything' and 'He is able to do anything.' The Shaykh (R.A.), in the seventh chapter of his *Futūḥāt*, after having related the above-mentioned varieties, says: 'And then God collected all these four kinds of creation in one verse (*āyat*) of the Quran in the *Sūrat* of *Ḥujurāt*, and said: "Oh people, I have created you." Then Adam came about, and from male came about Eve, from female came about Jesus, and from the collectivity of male and female came about sons of Adam by way of marriage and birth.' And in the same way, in the same chapter, he says concerning the immanencing of Jesus due to the amplitude of the Divine Ability and Power, and due to his refutation of what the naturalists say—nothing can be immanenced from the water of the woman—he wrote the first two lines. That is to say, when Gabriel (S.A.) manifested in the image of a man, and when he blew through the dampness of the breath the spirituality of Jesus (S.A.), which is the Spirit of God, to Mary, at the level of the flowing of this in Mary the Spirit of God immanenced in the image of Man (which is Adam, S.A.) which is existent from mud in the water of Mary, or, equally, it became immanenced from the breath of Gabriel who was in the image of Man. That is why in the poem the Shaykh (R.A.) used the word 'or' which is for the purpose of being equivocal, because the naturalists deny that it is from the water of Mary and relegate it only to the breath of Gabriel. The Shaykh (R.A.) prefers that it is immanenced through the water of Mary, yet allows it to be possible that it could also be immanenced through the breath of Gabriel due to the amplitude of the Divine Power, because at the time of blowing Jesus, Gabriel (S.A.) was in the image of a man. However, in relation to God's Ability, whether the immanencing be from the water of Mary or breath of Gabriel is equal. Whichever, it means that Jesus was immanenced in the image of Man from the water of Mary according to what we say, or he was immanenced from the breath of Gabriel according to what others say.

Thus, whichever way it is, the emergence of the body of Jesus is different to the emergence of others, and his immanencing is the Divine Word. Consequently, in accordance with this consideration, to question is unnecessary. The words: 'From the water of Mary . . .' refer to the obliterated verb, and the verb with its actor is obliterated as the words 'immanencing of the Spirit' in the second verse point out, that is, as though it were that the Spirit was immanenced from the water of Mary or from the blowing of Gabriel. The words 'in the image of Man' also refer to the obliterated word 'immanencing'. It is also possible that the words 'in the image of Man' would refer to the blowing, which means the embodiment of the Spirit of God was either immanenced from the water of Mary or from the blowing of Gabriel who was then existent in the image of a man. It could also mean that Jesus, who was in the image of a man, was immanenced from the water of Mary and also from the blowing of Gabriel. That is to say, as Mary was a human being, and as Gabriel was manifested in the image of a man when he blew, Jesus was immanenced in the image of a man and manifested that way. Yet, Jesus is no other than the Spirit of God and the Word of God. Equally, the body that was immanenced is Jesus, but its spirit was not immanenced from the water of Mary or the blowing of Gabriel, because Jesus is that Divine Word which Gabriel, taking it without intermediary from the *haqq*, applied to Mary.

After this, the Shaykh (R.A.) makes it very clear by saying: And He created the body of Jesus certainly from the real water of Mary and the imagined water of Gabriel, and he came out in the image of a man by virtue of his mother and by virtue of Gabriel representing the image of a man. Thus Jesus was immanenced from two waters and only appeared in the image of a man because of his mother Mary, and Gabriel appearing in the image of a man. And God's words: 'I am no other than your Lord's envoy, come to give you as a gift an intelligent boy-child', and the words: 'And We blew therein from Our Spirit', established that the spiritual matter for the immanencing is from the blowing of Gabriel who was manifested with power of activity and effect, and the power of activity and effect manifests nothing unless there is opposite it the power of being effected and the power of being acted upon, the image of which is Mary, and the material of the body is from Mary; at the level of Gabriel blowing into Mary in the image of a man, the imagined water, which is in the matter of the dampness of the blowing, activating the real water in Mary and that flowing into

the womb. In the words: ‘. . . water of Mary’ it is allowable to consider that there is a question, where it says such as from water of Mary or blowing of Gabriel. That is to say, the Spirit in the image of Man which is existent from mud, is it from the water of Mary or from the blowing of Gabriel? That is to say, it is allowable to question: is his immanencing in the image of a man from the water of Mary or from the blowing of Gabriel? because it is equally possible that it be only from the water of Mary, or from the blowing of Gabriel alone, or equally allowable and possible that it be from both of these two waters.

**The Spirit immanenced in the person which is cleansed
From nature, which you name by ‘prison’ (*sijîn*)**

This couplet explains the previous couplet. What is meant by the purified being is the being of Mary, because God bore witness where she is concerned, with purity and cleanliness from human passions, by the words: ‘She was chaste, and We blew into her from Our Spirit.’ The word ‘nature’ in this couplet refers to the cleansed, and does not mean Total Nature, and refers to the partial nature which is in the lower aspects, and the words ‘which is named’ is the adjective for the word ‘nature’, and the letter *ta* is for addressing because it addresses only the verifying gnostic. The pronoun for the actor in these refers to God, and the pronoun for the acted-upon refers to nature, which then would mean as if it were: which God has named by His words as ‘prison’. And the word ‘prison’ (*sijîn*) is one of the names of the place of dissolution. The word ‘*ta’udduha*’, ‘you named it’ or ‘he named it’, its actor pronoun may refer to nature, and its pronoun for being acted upon may refer to the person. Under these considerations the letter *ba* might come to mean ‘to’, in which case the verse would mean: Jesus, who is the Spirit of God, came to be immanenced from the universe of nature which you call ‘prison’ or God calls ‘prison’, to be immanenced in the cleansed person, which means that when Gabriel blew into Mary, the Spirit of God came to be immanenced in the person of Mary. That is why he qualified with cleanliness from the ordinary natural desires, because mankind is the place of blame, specially so that in this order application to Mary where this order is of the determinations of nature was qualified with cleanliness from determinations of nature in the case of Mary. In this there is a further munificence in that when Gabriel appeared to Mary in the form of a young man, in the first instance there was a constriction in Mary, and to alleviate this Gabriel said: ‘I

bring to you a present for you of an intelligent boy-child.' Thus, with these words, when Mary was relaxed and pleased, her relaxation was not due to natural passions of nature or from her inclination to a young man, and there would not have been a constriction in Mary at the sight of the image of a young man if before that it was rather that Gabriel had said to her: 'Oh Mary, God sends you joyful news by His Word from Him, whose name is the Messiah.' It was due to this Divine joyful message that again she was relaxed and pleased from the joy of Gabriel, and thus at this moment of relaxing and elation that Gabriel (S.A.) breathed to her the Jesus (S.A.), and it is then that her interior, which was cleansed from natural human agitation, elated with Divine joy, and at the level of the sweetness of her interior, from the manifestation of waters of desire which flowed to her womb, created the desire which was caused in her from the manifestation of the Divine Love. This was definitely not natural desires. It is also possible and allowable that the purified person might be the person of Jesus, which means: in the image of the person cleansed from the nature which is called 'prison', which is the image of his body in the image of Man, he was immanenced.

And the humankind is manifested with the qualities of nature which is the lowest of the low. Such a nature that it is called 'prison', and prison is the limit of destitution and farness, and this is why the humankind is in prison in the universe of nature, because he is imprisoned and shut up in natural qualities and the conditions of darkness. Thus, the determinations of nature having been collected over his spirituality, he is veiled from the universe of light and holiness. God says: 'Then We returned them to the lowest of the low except those who believe and do pure acts.' Thus, the person of the body of Jesus is cleansed from the universe of nature, and he qualified him thus because of that, because the Spirit of God, even when it is manifested in the image of Man in the aspect above-mentioned, is still according to the original cleanliness and essential purity and is cleansed from the natural qualities. It is also possible and allowable that it may apply to the words of immanencing, first in the words: 'From the water of Mary or from the blowing of Gabriel, in the image of a man . . .' as in the first couplet, or to 'immanencing' as in the second couplet. Thus, the word 'or' can be taken to mean 'and/or'. Under this consideration it would mean that the body of Jesus, which is named with the Spirit of God, was immanenced with the water of Mary and the blowing of Gabriel in the image of a man which is existent from mud, immanenced

in the human body of Jesus or in the person of Mary which are 'cleansed person'. Under this aspect it is equally possible to say that the words: 'in the image of Man' refer to the blowing of Gabriel. In this case it would mean that from the blowing, which is the appearance of Gabriel in the image of the man which is existent from mud, and the water of Mary, the Spirit of God became immanenced in the 'cleansed person' as mentioned, just as his body is the image of humanity or the body of the person of his mother Mary.

**Due to this his abiding was lengthened,
Therein more than a thousand years appointed**

Which means to say, in the person cleansed from the mischiefs of nature which is the body of Jesus (S.A.), due to the manifestation and immanencing of the Spirit of God, the residing of the Spirit of God in that body which is the cleansed person was lengthened and its abiding there by appointment is over a thousand years. Or else, due to the immanencing of the Spirit of God in the person of Mary who is the purest and the cleanest of the manifestations of nature, the abiding of the Spirit of God in that image of human nature was lengthened (was not lengthened) because the person who is the cleanest and purest of the manifestations of nature is Mary, and the Spirit of God was immanenced therein. Thus, the abiding of Jesus in this universe in the images of nature is derived from this mystery of Mary's nature, and the abiding of Jesus (S.A.) in the image of the human spirituality was more than a thousand years at the time of the Shaykh, because from the birth of Jesus to the birth of Mohammed there were 555 years, and the date of this book is 627 years, but it comes to 626 years because the order of publicizing of this book from the Envoy (S.A.) to the Shaykh (R.A.) happened in the month of Muharrem of the seventh year. However, from the date of the birth of Christ to the date of the book it was a definite time of over a thousand years. As to the birth of Christ to the birth of the Envoy (S.A.), the definite length of time was added to the date between the hejira of the Envoy and the date of the book, it is 1181 years. Thus the abiding of the Spirit of God in that image until this time, and after this time until the time of his descent, due to his place of abode being his body by which he is present, because his body is equally spiritual, but due to the image of the humanity of Mary and due to the manifestation of Gabriel in the image of a man, he was manifested in the image of a man, or else, due to the fact that

his mother Mary is of the purest of the manifestations of nature. Thus, according to the first aspect, the word '*fihā*' (therein) refers to the image of the body of Jesus which is the person of Jesus, and the second aspect is that it refers to nature. And Sadruddin-i-Konevi, God sanctify his mystery, in his *Fukūk* says: 'The image of Jesus was immanenced from the Divine Word through the speech of Gabriel, and his establishment in this universe for a length of time is derived from the mystery of the nature of Mary (S.A.) and engenders the contagion of the power of nature from Mary therein with the blowing of Gabriel of the Word, and that specifies the Gabrielian representation as a young man, that is to say, handsome and temperate, and the state of the action resembles from a certain aspect an emission without sexual intercourse.' (In the union of the two humidities thus, although following the natural order of the human procreation due to the necessities of immanencing in the shape and body of a human being, yet definitely avoiding totally any form of sexual contact, of which lower forms of human nature both Mary, the Spirit of God and Gabriel were entirely cleansed.)

**Spirit from God and no other, and because of that
He revived the dead and built a bird from mud**

Now let it be known like this, that every prophet from among the prophets is a place of manifestation from among the Divine places of manifestation, but due to a specific and definite consideration. Thus, due to this consideration and this reason, to bring into being each prophet and each thing there is individuated a Name for the *ḥaqq* by virtue of which Name that prophet is made to rely upon the *ḥaqq*. It is equally this way for the business of each existent, that by virtue of that specific consideration, to bring it about and to manifest it a Name is individuated from the *ḥaqq* and on which Name that existent depends. However, the difference between the prophets and the great among the saints, and the places of manifestation below these, is this, that the prophets and the great saints are the places of manifestation of the totality of all the Names, where their relationship to other Names on which depend the remainder of existents and the collectivity of people is the same relationship to the persons which are the individuals of genuses and varieties. And as there are differences in the determination of width or largeness among the genuses and varieties, it is the same way for the order among the prophets and the saints in the station of superiorities. Thus, each prophet's dependence upon the *ḥaqq* is due to

a specific Name, and the smallness and the largeness of the people and subjects is due to the encompassing and determination of that Name. The Envoy (S.A.), in a *ḥadīth* concerning the Day of Judgement, said: 'Then, prophets will come and with them will be a band of people, and the prophet with whom two people, and the prophet with whom one person, and the prophet with whom not one person.' Hence the mystery of this is that each prophet's or saint's dependence on the *ḥaqq* and his reliance upon Him is due to an individuation and a specific consideration, which consideration is called by a Name of the Divine Names, except the Envoy of God, upon whom be praise and peace, and the perfect ones among his heirs, who are not reliant or dependent upon the *ḥaqq* through the aspect of one Name. Even though the reliance of the big ones to the *ḥaqq* ends up in the First *ta'ayyun* which involves the Essential Uniqueness and includes the totality of all the individuations which is qualified by the *ḥaqq* in consideration of the Oneness of the *ḥaqq* which is the origin of condition of the Qualities and Names, yet the affairs with the First *ta'ayyun* of the Envoy (S.A.) and his perfect heirs is different from the others because the *ta'ayyun awwal* is not the aim of these in every aspect in their gnosis of the *ḥaqq* and their dependence on the *ḥaqq*. Perhaps rather that these are singularized in one state, which state is particular to them. After the *ḥaqq*, aside from themselves, nobody knows this. The *ta'ayyun awwal* is individualized and imprinted in the width of their receptivity, and the determinations and effects of the totality of the individuations of the Divine Names which are in the *ta'ayyun awwal* are manifest in their places of manifestation.

Now, the appearance of the *ta'ayyun awwal* is Divinity, and this degree is called with the Name God (*Allāh*). Indeed God created Adam in His own image and Adam is created according to the image of this degree, and Adam is the first place of manifestation of this degree and its appearance, and the interior of this degree is Divinity, and the spirituality and the reality of Jesus, which is the Being of the *rahmān*, is like the spirituality of that degree, just as Adam is the embodiment of that degree. Thus, because the spirit of Jesus accumulates in itself the totality of the Divine Names and emanates from the interior of the Divinity which is named by the Name *Allāh*, he is manifested with the totality of the qualification and determination of the Names which is the degree of Divinity. That is why he (the Shaykh) said: 'Spirit from God and no other . . .' That is to say, Jesus (S.A.) is the Divine Spirit

individuated from the interior of the Name *Allâh*, and is not individuated from subsequent Names which are the Presences of other Names. This is why he brought to life the dead and he built a bird out of mud, and the bird he built was a kind of bat. God says in relating this: 'In fact he created for them from mud in the shape of a bird and blew into it and it became a bird by permission of God, and he cured the blind-born and the leper and brought to life the dead by the permission of God.' Thus the spirit of Jesus (S.A.) emanating from the degree of Divinity which is the orphan's possession and the possession of Mohammed, and being individuated in the Presence of Divinity and his being dependent upon the collective Name just like the being of the Envoy (S.A.), the relationship of Jesus to him became complete, and his knowledge and covenant was made close to the knowledge and covenant of the Envoy (S.A.), and it is apportioned to him to enter the sainthood of Mohammed in the second emergence because his manifestation and individuation is equally from the sainthood of Mohammed in the Presence of Divinity.

**So that it be true for him that his origin is from his Lord
And by it have effect in the high and in the low.**

That is to say, that is why the creation and bringing to life manifested from Jesus (S.A.), that which is of Divine speciality, and that is why God the High manifested creation and bringing to life from the place of manifestation of Jesus, so that for Jesus from his Lord, which is the Name God, become true his relationship and origin, by which relationship and origin he be effective in the high and the low. That is to say, according to: 'To God is the possession of the heavens and the earth', determination and effect and change and dispensing in the high degrees and the low places of descent is specific to God the High. Thus, the relationship and origin of Jesus (S.A.) from God became established because his spirit is individuated from the interior of the Presence of Divinity and accordingly he manifested with all the totality of Divine Qualifications which that complete totality contains, so that he could manifest his Lordship from the aspect of viceregency in the higher universes and the lower degrees and determine by it, and in the same way, that he effect in the higher orders by bringing to life the human image, and in the lower orders by creating from mud the bat. By effecting in the higher and the low there becomes established for him

from his Lord his origin and relationship, because bringing to life and creation are the specialities of the High God.

**God cleansed him bodily and transcendentally,
Spiritually, and made him the symbol of His immanencing.**

(In certain copies it reads 'to immanencing'.) Which means that God the High cleansed the body of Jesus from the vicissitudes of human kinds and the details (*qadr*) of nature, because his image, from the point of view of essence, is embodied spirit. He also transcended his spirit from the forms of nature and the qualities of elements and sanctified it. That is why he was not killed and was not crucified. In fact, God the High, with His words: 'They did not kill him and they did not crucify him', informs of this fact, because his body was devoid of the attirements of *hayûlâ* and was strengthened with the Holy Spirit; and similarized him to Himself through the cause of immanencing, that is to say, by immanencing him in the first emergence, by his immanencing the bird from the mud and immanencing in the dead and the ill conditions which are of life and well-being. That is to say, because of that immanencing He made him similar to Himself, that is to say, He made him similar to Himself in the resurrecting of the dead and the creation of the bird. 'Indeed God created Man in His own Image.'

It is not necessary from the establishment of similarity which happens in the partial order from the Divine imaging that similarity is established in every aspect, because similarity is not absolute, it is relative. Bringing to life the dead, the immanencing of the bird from mud and the curing of the blind and the leper, these are all of Divine specialities, and if the word 'to immanencing', if it is with the letter *lam*, it would mean: He made him similar due to manifestation of immanencing from him. And in the second emergence He made it similar to Himself in Qualities by making him Viceregent of God and the Seal of Sainthood. Or, through the understanding: 'Indeed Jesus at the level of God is similar to the similarity of Adam', God made the immanencing of Jesus similar to that of Adam without a father or mother, by creating him without a father. Or He made him similar to Eve by immanencing him from Mary without a father, just as He immanenced Eve from Adam. In which case, to say the similarity of Jesus at the level of God is similar to Adam would mean: indeed the similarity of Jesus at the level of God is similar to Eve, which is like as female is created from male, so is male created from female, but as the woman is a place for accusation.

finding it more dextrous than making it similar to Eve, it was said 'similar to Adam', and this aspect is one of the aspects of what this above-mentioned verse indicates. The Shaykh (R.A.), in the tenth chapter of the *Futûhât*, says: 'The sealing of the earth from the cycle of possession is similar to its not having begun, which indicates the fact that the superabundance is in the Hand of God, and that this order does not necessitate a first father for his person, and He brought into being Jesus from Mary and descended to the place of descent of Adam and descended Jesus to the place of descent of Eve, and as He brought about the female from the male, He brought about male from the female, and sealed it with the similarity of there being no beginning to that which He brings about as son without a father, just as Eve was without a mother, and Jesus and Eve are brother and sister, and Adam and Mary are their parents.' 'In fact "similarity of Jesus at the level of God is like the similarity of Adam" is making a resemblance to the non-existence of male parenthood, from the point of view that an indication like this to Jesus is for the acquittal of his mother and does not make a resemblance to Eve because in fact the order concerning that in immanencing is that the woman is the place of accusation by the existence of child-bearing, as it is the place subject for the birth, and the man by place is not the same as this, and the intention from his indication is the lifting up of doubts. In the case of Eve there is no extraction from immanencing from Adam, because Adam has no place of derivation from him for the purposes of birth, and this is no proof except for those who establish the being of Adam and his immanencing and immanencing from him, and as there is no issue of a son without a father, in the same way there is no issue without a mother. And this example is by way of meaning, and that in fact Jesus is like Eve, but because into this enters that which has been said from the one who denies the immanencing of the woman, so we have called it the place of derivation from, and in this way was the accusation. The example therefore of Adam is (the result of) the acquittal of Mary which may result ordinarily. And definitely the manifestation of Jesus from Mary without a father is the same as the manifestation of Eve from Adam without a mother, and he is the second father.'

Know that it is the portion of spirits that they transport to a thing nothing other than life for that thing, and life becomes fluent therein in that thing, and it is because of that that Sâmirî took a handful from the envoy who is Gabriel and who is Spirit, and Sâmirî knew of this order,

and when he knew that it was Gabriel he knew that life was flowing therein, and would transport it, and he took a handful from the effect of the envoy, whether (this handful be with the letter) *ḡād* or with the letter *ṣād*, that is to say, either he filled his hand with it or just with his fingers, and threw it into the calf, and the calf lowed (mooed) as it is this voice of the cow when it moos. Had it been present in another image the name of the sound would be in relation to that, since it is according to the image, just as the frothy gurgle is for the camel and the deep bleating is for the ram and the light bleating is for the lamb, and the voice of Man is either speech or talk. Now, let it be known like this, that Spirit is of the *nafs-ar-raḥmân*, and life is an essential quality for the Spirit. Thus, if the Spirit were to affect a body from among the bodies, or if its representative image proceeded to it, life would be manifested in that body in accordance with the image of that body. If that body was a person of equal temper and was capable of receiving life, then it would manifest in him due to the special temper, due to senses and motions and all the particularities of life particular to that temper, and as much as the Spirit is forceful, strong, its effect equally would be strong and forceful and would totally manifest his particularity.

Now, you be knowledgeable in this way, that in fact it is of the speciality of the spirits that they do not transport to anything but that thing definitely becomes alive and that life flows in them. And it is because of that that Sâmirî took a handful from the effects of the envoy which is Gabriel, and Gabriel is Spirit, since Sâmirî was knowledgeable of this order. That is to say that he had witnessed in his insight of the nature of slowly enticing to perdition, that Spirit does not proceed to a thing without that thing becoming alive. Thus, when Sâmirî knew that with his representative image on the *Hayzûm* (name of an angelic steed ridden by Gabriel)—which is also represented Spirit—that the total Spirit thus manifested was Gabriel (S.A.), he knew that definitely life had flowed into whatever place Gabriel had stepped on. Thus Sâmirî took a handful—whether this handful be with the letter *ḡād* or the letter *ṣād*—from the effect of the envoy, that is to say, from the earth upon which the foot of the horse of Gabriel (S.A.) had stepped. (If it is with the letter *ḡād* it means a handful. If it is with the letter *ṣād*, then it means with the fingers only.) Thus he mixed that handful into the image of the calf which was taken from the ornaments of the nation. Consequently, that calf, becoming alive, mooed. That is to say, it shouted with this voice particular to it, because the voice of the cow is

mooring, and it is called mooring. If Sâmirî had placed the image in a different image than the calf, that is to say, if he had placed the subject of his construction to another image and brought it about in that other image and had mixed what he got as a handful from the effect of the envoy to it, or otherwise, if Sâmirî had placed the handful that he took from the effect of the envoy in a different image, certainly the name of the voice produced would be related to that particular image, just as frothy gurgling is for the camel, the low bleating is for the ram, the light bleating for the lamb, and the voice for the man, speech or words. That is to say, of all the images, whichever image Sâmirî had built and established and mixed it with it, there would have manifested the voice particular to that image and the voice of that image would have been related to that, just as the voice of the calf, which is mooring, is related to it, and is called the mooring of the calf. In the same way, the voice of another thing would have been related to that thing, just as the speech of Man and the words of Man.

Now, let it be known like this, that Gabriel (S.A.) is total Spirit, and he is the ruler of the seven heavens and that which is below them and upon birth and elements, and his place of rulership is the Lotus Tree of the Extreme Limit, and the Lotus Tree of the Extreme Limit is the image of the self (*nafs*) of the seventh sphere. Every one of the spirits of the high degree are effective in the totality of the lower degrees which are below that. Thus, the spirits of the other spheres which are below the seventh sphere are like the helpers, aiders, and powers of Gabriel. However, the spirit of the Sphere of the Moon which the philosophers call Active Intellect, is known by the gnostics as Ishmael, but that Ishmael is not the prophet. Perhaps rather that it is the angel which is the ruler of the universe of immanence and mischief, and he is of the subjects and helpers of Gabriel and he has no determination above the Sphere of the Moon, just as there is no determination or dispensing for Gabriel above the Lotus Tree. Consequently, if Gabriel (S.A.) were embodied in the representative image and manifested in the senses and he stepped upon a piece of earth of any kind and passed over it, it bestows on that spot extra life. All the high spirits are in this manner, and Sâmirî knew this meaning. When, before this, Sâmirî witnessed in the insight of the nature of slowly enticing to perdition, the angels which support the Throne, which are four, one in the image of Man, another in the image of an eagle, and one in the image of a lion and one in the image of a bull, the vision of Sâmirî attached itself to that

of the bull and he forgot the image of the Perfect Man, and he said: 'I saw that which I saw', just as if it were saying 'saw what you saw and knew what you knew'. The Shaykh (R.A.), in chapter thirteen of the *Futûhât*, in the exposition of the bearers of the Throne, says: 'The fourth in the image of a bull. That is what Sâmirî saw and imagined that that is the God of Moses and built it in the image of a calf and said what he said.' Thus, when Gabriel (S.A.) became embodied in the representative image and manifested, Sâmirî knew with his interior light that it was Gabriel. Thus, taking a handful from the earth where his horse had stepped, he mixed it into the image of the calf that he had fashioned, and the voice which is particular to that image, which is mooing, manifested from it. And if he had represented another image in the place of the image of the calf and had mixed it into that, the voice which is particular to that image would have manifested from it and that voice would have been related to the image which was the origin of that image. The spirit of this matter is this, that one Spirit becomes manifested in different places of manifestation, but in each place of manifestation is by virtue of that place of manifestation. Thus, the dispensing and effect of the Spirit is by virtue of the place of shapes and moulds, not by virtue of the Spirit. The colour of the water is the colour of its glass. Thus is the limit of the fluent life in things which are called Divine Nature (*lâhût*), and human nature (*nâsût*) which is the place by which that Spirit is present. Thus, life which is fluent in things is only this much and they are called life of *lâhût*, because Life is a Divine Quality, and perhaps rather that it is the same as the Divine Ipseity, whereas the *nâsût* is that place by which is present that Divine Spirit which is Life, and that place is alive by that Divine Spirit, and the *nâsût* is so called spirit because of what is present with it. Thus *nâsût*, which is the place for the Spirit, is figuratively called with the spirit because of the fact that the *nâsût* is present by the Spirit, because the *nâsût* includes the Spirit. That is why the place is called with the name of the state. That is why He called Jesus Spirit. That is to say, in consideration of his manifested being He called it Spirit. Nonetheless, Jesus is the Spirit of God and manifested in the image of a man due to his mother and due to the fact that Gabriel appeared to Mary in the image of a man. When the trustworthy Spirit, who is Gabriel (S.A.), was represented to Mary like a young man, she imagined it was a man who desired to fall upon her and she took refuge in God from it, from the totality of all this, so that God save her from him. Mary's taking refuge in God was

in total awareness and complete presence. Thus Mary (S.A.) did not know that it was Gabriel who had manifested to her in the image of a young man because Mary had no knowledge or an indication concerning the spirits so that she recognize them when they were embodied, like the Prophet (S.A.) knew. That is why she took refuge in God from him, and said: 'I take refuge in the *rahmân* from you', and she took refuge in the *rahmân* because of the imagined sorrow of a possible intercourse when she saw him in the image of a man. When she learnt that this was not permitted, total presence with God resulted in her, and that was the spiritual Spirit, because Mary knew that without legal marriage intercourse was not of the permitted order, legally or intellectually. Thus, in that taking refuge there came to Mary complete presence with God, and that complete presence is the spiritual Spirit which expanded that which is binding and constricting. There can be no expansion except in the revelation of the Breath of the *rahmân* in the spirit of the person. In a copy rigorously verified it reads: 'And brought about for her complete presence with God.' That is to say, Gabriel brought about for her the complete presence. That is to say, as Gabriel represented the image of a man and Mary imagined that he desired intercourse with her, by her taking refuge Gabriel was the cause of Mary's complete presence with God. If he had blown into her at this moment according to this state, by which Jesus would have come out, not one person would have been compatible with him because of the detestableness of his nature due to the state of his mother. That is to say, Gabriel (S.A.) did not blow Jesus into Mary in that state because he knew that the manifestation of the Spirit in a place is due to the individuation of that place. That is why he delayed the order of blowing until the resulting docility and the removal of the constriction from Mary. If Gabriel had blown Jesus into Mary when he appeared representing the image of a young man when Mary took refuge from him in her state of constriction, then Jesus (S.A.) would have come out with such a quality that not one man would have been able to bear him due to the repulsion of creation which emanated from the state of his mother Mary. This was because Gabriel appearing to Mary in the image of a young man, Mary imagined that he desired intercourse, whereas Mary was devoted virginally to God and was strict (true) believer in the world and was protective of legal intercourse, and her self (*nafs*) grieved; thus if Gabriel, the trustworthy, had blown over Mary the Spirit of God and the Word of God in that state, the state

of Mary's grief and constriction would have flowed in the Spirit of God, and the Spirit of God would have come out as a fault of creation so that not one person would have been able to bear any association with him, because the son becomes immanenced by virtue of the image of the imagination which is present as the state which is most dominant at that time over her spiritual and essential qualifications, at the time of her intercourse. The son is the mystery of his father. The son at that instant is according to the image of the state and the mystery which happens to be that of his father, and is not necessarily absolutely in his image, otherwise there would not have issued from the believer a non-believer, or from the non-believer a believer, and it would have meant that all one man's children would have been according to one image in image and character. That is why through knowledge and determination they order the imagining of the image of the most superior of the creatures at the time of intercourse, because the Spirit manifests due to the place, and its place is nature, because the human image in nature is imaged and embodied by virtue of nature. Thus, the trustworthy Spirit, observing the state of Mary's constriction and grief, retarded the order of blowing, and said: 'But I am indeed your Lord's envoy', and brought about the resulting in Mary of the docility. And when he said to her: 'But I am an envoy from your Lord, come to present you with a boy-child growing in Divine grace', she was extended from constriction and her chest was exhilarated. When Gabriel, the trustworthy, said to Mary (S.A.): 'I am not a human being so that you should be constricted. I am the envoy of your Lord. He sent me to you with the envoyship of the Spirit and the Word of God to present you with a boy-child growing in Divine grace, by the order of God transmitting the Divine order to you', Mary expanded from the constriction and her chest was exhilarated, because God had before this announced the joyful news of Jesus to Mary when the Angel had said: 'Oh Mary, God sends you the joyful news of His Word from Him, whose name is Messiah, Jesus, son of Mary, honourable in the world and the other world and of those brought close.' This time, when Mary heard the words of the Angel telling her that he was an envoy for this purpose, she remembered the announcement of the joyful news, because Mary was expecting God's promise to take place. Thus, she knew that because of that promise the trustworthy Spirit had been represented and manifested in the image of a man, and that the trusted Spirit was transmitting the Word of God and that it was the time for

the fulfilment of that promise, and with her chest exhilarated and released into expansion from constriction she did not feel withdrawn from Gabriel. Thus, Gabriel approached her in the form of a man, and blew into her at this moment Jesus (S.A.). Gabriel was transporting the Word of God to Mary like the envoy transports the word of God to his people, and these are the speeches and the words which he deposited (*ilqā*) with Mary, and the Spirit from Him. Just as the envoy takes from God the meanings of the Divine words from the aspects of spirituality and of internal meanings, and transports them to his people with his spirituality, and deposits them in the hearts of the human selves and in the words of mankind, in the same way, Gabriel (S.A.), being represented in the image of a man, transported to Mary Jesus, which is the Word of God, and with the blowing and the self of that image he deposited it. Rather like when Gabriel transported the Divine inspiration to the Envoy (S.A.), in the same way he transported Jesus, which is the Word of God, to Mary. The image of the transportation is the same. However, the taking from God in both cases does not have to be in the same way, because Gabriel took the Spirit of God without intermediary from the Presence of God's Name which is the Name of totality. Each of the envoys takes the Divine words that come down to them from the Presence of the Divine Name which is its private Lord and the source of effusion of one of the Divine Names, unless it happened to be that the private Lord of the envoy who takes, happens to be the Name God, which is the collective Name.

The desire flowed in Mary, and Jesus was created from the true water of Mary and the imaginary water of Gabriel which was fluent in the humidity of this blowing, because the blowing from the animal body is humid because there is an area of water in it, and the body of Jesus was immanenced from the imaginary water and the real water. Thus, with the blowing, desire was fluent in Mary and ran into her womb. Thus the body of Jesus was immanenced from real water on the side of Mary and imaginary water from the side of Gabriel, such an imagined water that it flowed to the womb of Mary from the humidity in that blow, because the blow which comes from an animal body is humid because there is in it existent something of the area of water. Thus, the body of Jesus was immanenced from the imaginary water, a water which is in the humidity of the blowing of Gabriel, and from the real water, the water which is excited in Mary. Thus, as mentioned before, when Mary continued to be in the sanctuary the Angel had prophesied to her with

the words: 'Oh Mary, God gives you the joyful news of His Word, whose name is Messiah, Jesus, son of Mary', from which manifests the child which is the Spirit of God. Consequently, in accordance with the determination of the known custom of child-bearing, and not through the witnessing of Divine Ability, Mary said: 'Lord, how can I have a child and no man has touched me?' And the Angel said to her: 'It is thus. For your Lord this is of little importance, to bring a sign (*âyat*) for the people, and Mercy from Us, and this was an order of decree (*qaḍâ*).' Consequently, Mary was expecting the Divine wisdom and was desirous of the arrival of the child, and when Gabriel appeared to Mary in the form of a man and said: 'I am the envoy from your Lord, to present you with a boy-child growing in Divine grace', Mary knew that according to the Divine promise Gabriel had come down to deposit the child with her. But Gabriel (S.A.) manifested for the purpose of bringing into existence the child in the image of a man by the order of God, and it is of the order of things that at the proposition of birth it is brought about from his water. Thus Mary thought that the child that would come about as she imagined, could only result from the water of the man, and that Gabriel's presenting her with a son would be according to the usual determination from Gabriel's water. Consequently, Mary, being first given the omen of joy of a son and then afterwards hearing that the son was carried by Gabriel, became expanded and desirous of taking the child and became ardently desirous of taking the Word of the *ḥaqq* from Gabriel. Consequently Gabriel, approaching Mary, blew into her Jesus which is the Spirit of God, and the desire of Mary went into motion in two aspects and flowed in her. One of the ways is this, that just as in other women as necessitated by being of the humankind where desire moves, Mary equally, on reaching the time of her period in the same way as usual for receiving the child, her desire moved for receiving the child by the order of God, and with the blowing of Gabriel it flowed into her womb, because, in women, most often the agitation of desire happens at the time of being purified from the period (menstruation), and Mary (S.A.) was cut away from her people at the time of the cutting-away of the blood for the purposes of ablution, and for Mary that time was the time for the excitement of desire, and the coming out of the child from the human beings does not happen except in accordance with the usual determination with the presence of the movement of desire, and at the level of Mary's imagination of the fulfilment of the promise of God in the words of

Gabriel who appeared in the image of a handsome young man: ' . . . and to present you with a child growing in the Divine grace', and at the level of the knowledge that the Word of God would be deposited with her from the place of manifestation of Gabriel in the image of a man, and at the level of desiring the child which was promised, desires moved in her in the usual determined way, because the conditions of intercourse were collected consequent to the arousing of the desire in her for that child which God had announced to her, and with her wish for it and from the expansion of the self because the time of the promise had arrived, and Gabriel's graciousness to her in the image of a handsome young man, and knowing that he was to deposit with her the boy-child who would grow in the Divine grace, her desire moved exactly as in the moment of sexual fulfilment and Mary conceived at the level of the blowing of Gabriel, and with the breath of Gabriel her own pure water flowed into her womb. Thus, in consequence of the words of Gabriel: 'I am an envoy from your Lord and will present you with a boy-child growing in Divine grace', and in accordance with the special face, to take the child which is the Spirit of God from the speech of Gabriel from God, specifically concerning Mary, her desire moved and flowed in her. Now, the other aspect is this: the love which was flowing in Mary, emanating from the Essential Love, is the desire of the Divine Love, just as for the Divine Knowledge the bringing into existence of the creation and its manifestation, it is the facing of that very Divine Love. 'I was a hidden treasure and I loved that I be known, and I have created the creation so that I am known.' Thus, as the Divine Will applied to the coming into being of the body of Jesus in Mary, the desire consequent to the Divine Love which was in strength in Mary, moved by the order of God, and with the blowing of Gabriel flowed in her; and the fact that the body of Jesus was created from real water from Mary's side and imaginary water from the side of Gabriel, and the water of Gabriel being imaginary, is this: this is because the one who blew is the represented image. Gabriel is not the blower in his real image. Therefore, in him, quiddity is equally represented and is imaginary, and in that image water is not manifest in its true image. And the majority of the commentators prefer this aspect where the fact that it is imaginary water is possibly from the imagination of Mary, because when she saw Gabriel in the image of a man she imagined that a child would have to be from the water of a man; consequently, Mary being affected by her imagination, and from her imagination that from

his blowing spiritual and water of light was created, from which the body of Jesus was created. However, at our level this aspect is not established because the subject-matter of the imagination and reality has to be both from the side of Mary, whereas the Shaykh (R.A.) said: 'The body of Jesus was created from real water from Mary and from imaginary water from Gabriel', and after this he also says: 'He came out in the image of a man because of God and because of Gabriel being represented in the image of a man.' Thus, that the water should be imaginary is from the side of Gabriel by virtue of the fact that Gabriel was represented and illusory in the form of a man. This is so because Gabriel is the ruler of elements and is quite capable that from his breath of *rahmân* he would effect spiritual water in his blowing and make it into water. So understand. And at the level of blowing of Gabriel without manifested water, that Jesus' body should be created only from Mary is of Divine Ability. Thus, with the birth of Jesus without a father the four kinds of birth become complete. One kind is as Man which was created from earth coming into being without parents. Another kind is the creation of the female from the man alone, like the creation of Eve from Adam. And another kind is the coming into being of the male from the female alone, like the coming into being of Jesus from Mary. And the fourth kind is the birth of Man from the being of both parents. The Shaykh (R.A.), in chapter 73 of his *Futûhât*, says: 'And from them one man, and in all time without coming into being of another in his place, and he resembles Jesus (S.A.), born between Spirit and Man and with no known human father for him, just as is related concerning Bilqîs who was born between the jinn and Man and she was composed of two different kinds, and he is the Man of the isthmus, and for him God preserves the isthmus for always and there is no interval at any time of one like this man who was born in this quality, and he is created from the water of God, contrary to what is mentioned in the knowledge of the people of the naturalists in that he was not immanenced as a child from the water of mothers. However, God is able to do anything.'

And he came out in the image of a man due to God and due to the representation of Gabriel in the image of a man, so that there does not happen an immanencing in this humankind except in accordance with the usual determination, which means that Jesus (S.A.) came out in the image of a man due to his mother Mary and due to the representation of Gabriel in the image of a man, so that in this humankind there be

no immanencing except in accordance with the usual determination. That is to say, Jesus is the Spirit of God but his appearance in the image of a man is due to the relationship of his mother Mary and due to the representation of Gabriel in the image of a young man, so that no immanencing may come about in this humankind except in accordance with the usual determination and in accordance with the known wisdom. In other words, from Mary should be born again a human being, because an image that the women witness at the time of intercourse or imagine in the image of the child has for it a very great effect. They even relate that when a certain woman gave birth, her child was born with his image as the image of a man but his body was like the body of a snake, and when she was questioned about this she told that at the time of her intercourse she had seen a snake. Consequently, Jesus manifested in the image of the sons of Man because the most noble and the most honourable image is the image of a man, which is created in accordance with the image of God. 'In fact, God created Adam in His own Image.' Consequently, because of the honourableness of this image, God made the immanencing in the humankind in accordance with the usual determination, and because of transcending him that there be no image immanenced unless that of Man, because the creation of Man is particular to God as He is revealed in the image of Man. 'Indeed God kneaded the dough of Man for forty days.' Thus, that is why after forty days of kneading the dough the image of Man became revealed, and God the Great was revealed in the image of Man in the materia of the Divine Nature (*lâhût*) of Light by virtue of the uniqueness of the collectivity of the great isthmuseity, and then He kneaded the dough of Man. In the same way, Jesus (S.A.) was born due to Gabriel (S.A.) blowing into Mary the Spirit of God at the moment of her expansion and the exhilaration of her breast, when her image was of beauty and her face was relieved, full of announcement of joy and smiling with announcement of joy, and expansion was dominant over her. And there came out Jesus (S.A.), bringing to life the dead because he was the Divine Spirit, and giving life belonged to God and the blowing to Jesus (S.A.) was just like the blowing to Gabriel of the Word of God. Thus, Jesus (S.A.), manifesting with the quality of Life, came out giving life to the dead because indeed he is of Divine Spirit, and Divine Spirit does not pass by something without giving life to that thing, and in that place of manifestation which was Jesus, giving life was particular to God and it was established for Jesus to blow it,

just as it was established for Gabriel to blow concerning Jesus and the Word was particular to God. That is to say, Jesus was born with reviving the dead because he was the Spirit of God, and in the place of his manifestation that which revived in reality was God and the blowing was that of Jesus. Thus, in consideration of the fact that God is reviver, giving life which is in the place of manifestation of Jesus, equally reviving becomes veridic, and in one aspect becomes conjectural in relationship to the blowing of Jesus. From another aspect that also is veridic, which will be mentioned after this. In fact, in consideration of another aspect, both veracity and conjecture exist in the nature of the body of Jesus since the blowing was from the place of manifestation of Gabriel in the image of a young man. Whatever, the blowing of Gabriel is conjectural because he blew by way of appearing in the image of a man, and in the same way, the existence of Gabriel is equally conjectural and illusory in relationship to the Being of God. In reality, both being and blowing belong to God. Thus, in all cases of consideration, the blowing which is in Gabriel is conjectural and the Word is veridic. It is effusive from the Presence of Divinity. Thus the body of Jesus manifested from the blowing of Gabriel and from the Divine Word which was effusive from the Presence of Divinity.

Now let it be known like this, that although words are many by virtue of the Presences, yet they are enclosed in the motherhood of three. One word is this, that it is the body of the collectivity of uniqueness which is derived from the manifested, immanental, of possession, of witnessing and of bodily letters. Thus, under this consideration, all existents are Divine words. Another word is this: the letters which are derived from the interior, the angelic and the spiritual, which is the body of the collectivity of uniqueness like the beautifully collected existents which are the spirits of intellects and selves and the angels, which are spiritual, holy and ever-praised (*subbûh*) words. The third word is this: the body of the collectivity of uniqueness which collects between the realities of the bodily letters, spiritual letters and the Divine letters. This word is the reality of each Perfect Man which is of this kind of human being, but upon each one of these perfects there is the dominion of the determination of one degree from the degrees mentioned above. The Messianic Jesus Word was the collectivity of the body of uniqueness which was in between the reality of the Divine letters and the reality of spiritual letters, and the spirituality of the letters was dominant over the reality of the letters of bodiliness, and upon the

spirituality of the letter the letter of *lâhût* was dominant. That is why people said of him: 'God is the Messiah, son of Mary', by the error of those who spoke deviationally.

All the complete perfect ones, that they are words which are derived from the realities of spiritual letters and bodily letters happens after their being manifested in the genus of this human emergence. That they are words of the Divine Unknowable is that they are derived from the letters of the Unknowable whose collection is the cause of the existence of the spirits, and the letters of the Unknowable are nothing other than the determinations of necessarily-so-ness which are the aspects and effects of the Names of the Ipseity. Consequently, when the High *ḥaqq* is revealed in the degree of Divinity by virtue of the letters which are the Names of the Ipseity, through the letters of the *a'yân*, which are effected by their complementary opposition which in fact are the receptivities of the realities of the *a'yân*, naturally there happens a joining-together whereby the letters of the Unknowable become particularized and individuated in the letters of the receptive *a'yân*. Thus, if the letters of the receptivities of the *'ayns* come close to each other, which are in complementary opposition to each of the determinations of the letters of the Unknowable, then are derived the words of the Unknowable, and equally, when the letters of the receptivity of the *a'yân* which are the totality of the letters of the Ipseity which have been effected in the degree of Divinity are collected together, then results the collective total Divine Word, and that word is the reality of the spirituality of the image of Jesus which is derived from the imprinting of the letters of the totality in that degree. This is why He said: 'It is the Word that He implanted into Mary.' There is another aspect which consists of the application of the Divine original letters of the *ḥaqq* to things due to the fact that they are according to His Oneness, and these are the first keys and they are called the 'keys of the Unknowable' (*mafâriḥ al-ghayb*). These are the Names of the Ipseity and the 'mothers' of original things, which quiddities are of their necessities and are the results of the appertenance of their knowledgeabilities. The parallel (*naẓîr*) of these is the imaging of the human self before the particularization of the images that a man knows in his own mind. These are singular dispensations which are exempt from spiritual, mental and sensory conjunction. In that mentation things are one the same as the other. In the second mentation, it is the mentation of the quiddities which are the individuations by virtue of relative differentiation in the

Essential area of Knowledge. This is the Presence of figuration to which allude the greater ones of the verifiers and the past wise people as that the things are in figuration in the Self of the *ḥaqq*. This degree is the second degree of the letters of the Unknowable. Thus, by virtue of its singularization from the necessities of its quiddity, its mentation is the realm of meaning and the Word that is Jesus. Under this consideration, the reality of the spirituality of Jesus is the Divine Word, 'and it is His Word that He implanted in Mary.' And of the expansion of that being which is the effusion over that quiddity, and the mentation of that quiddity with all its necessities, is the spiritual, meaningful, unknowable word, and due to the mentation prior to its connection of its being to the necessities of that quiddity, it becomes the quiddity of the letters of being, and in accordance with the quiddity of being and its total necessities by virtue of its expansion, it becomes the quiddity of the word of being. Consequently, under this consideration, all existents become Divine words.

The fact that Jesus brought to life the dead is true revivification by virtue of the fact that it manifested from his blowing. Thus, where dead people are concerned, Jesus' revivification of them was a veridic revivification because of that coming about and manifesting as one could witness through the eyes that it came through his blowing. Thus, his being qualified by bringing to life is allowable by mores and knowledge, through the witnessing of the senses and through verification. Equally it is permissible because his quiddity is the Quiddity of the *ḥaqq*, and he is equally the *lāhūt* and spirituality and the uniqueness of the images of the collectivity. Thus, blowing is attributed to him in consideration of his quiddity being the *lāhūt*. Though he manifested in the image of his mother, as in being born as child Jesus (S.A.) was in concordance with the determinations of being born and manifested in the image of his mother. Thus, the creaturality of his body became true from the side of his mother because the water of Mary was real. Equally for Jesus the bringing to life of the dead is real by virtue of his being blown. In that aspect mentioned above, Jesus is attributable and related to Mary. That is why he is referred to as Jesus, son of Mary. Thus equally the attribution of bringing to life to the image of Jesus which was blown for bringing to life, bringing to life is real and bringing to life is related to him.

Equally, his bringing to life is conjectural in that it was from him, but that yet it was from God. In certain copies it reads that Jesus collected

in his reality the conjectural and the real bringing to life. In certain other copies, concerning his reality one reads that its nature was, as we have said, that he was a creature of conjectural water and real water. Equally, the bringing into life by Jesus (S.A.) was conjectural because perhaps that it was rather that the bringing into life was in reality from God, because the real Actor and the Possessor of the totality of the Qualities is God. Thus Jesus collected between the real bringing to life and the conjectural bringing to life because of the fact that it was necessitated by his reality according to which was created his body. In fact, we have already mentioned that indeed Jesus was created from conjectural water and real water. From one aspect, the bringing into life is related to him by way of reality, and from another aspect by way of conjecture. This sentence explains the word 'he collected' in some of the copies. That is to say that in one aspect it is by way of reality that bringing to life is related to Jesus, and in another aspect by way of conjecture. That is to say, when the body of Jesus (S.A.) was created from conjectural water and real water, the reality and conjecture manifested from his action. Consequently, bringing to life is related to him both by way of reality and by way of conjecture, because his action is a branch of the origin of his being immanenced, and God the High in the Quranic words considered both aspects, because the two aspects together are of the necessities of his essential creation, and God says therein, that is to say, in truth Jesus (S.A.): 'He brought to life' by way of reality, and before that, by way of conjecture: 'He blew into it and it became a bird by the permission of God.' Here the actor is not that he blew, but the blowing was the actor. And it became a bird due to the fact of its sensory bodily image. By way of reality it was said concerning Jesus' bringing to life, that is to say, God said: 'He brought to life the dead', and God actually attributed the bringing into life to him, and by way of conjecture it was said concerning his bringing into life that he blew into it and it became a bird by the permission of God. Thus, in the genitive case, that is to say, in the words 'by the permission of God', the actor is the word 'it became' and not the word 'blowing', but it is possible in the genitive that the word 'blowing' is the actor. Thus it is possible that under this consideration it be like this: as to what Jesus constructed out of mud in the shape of the sensory body of a bird, it becomes a bird by virtue of the sensory bodily image and not due to the reality of its spirituality, because as Jesus (S.A.) is created from real water and conjectural water due to his mother Mary and to the appearance of

Gabriel in the image of a man, thus manifesting in the image of a man, his action under one consideration is real, and under another consideration conjectural, and the manifestation of that thing in the image of the sensory body is due to the manifestation in the sensory image of Jesus. Thus, even in the bird, which is his action, there existing reality and conjecture, the immanencing of the bird is not real from every aspect, otherwise there would have to be no conjecture in it. Thus again, the fact that it did become a bird is by virtue of the image of his image being an image of sensory body. In other words, it becomes a bird by virtue of its image, but in consideration of the oneness of the collectivity of the image of the reality of spirituality and the sensory image, it is not a bird according to reality without conjecture. That is why the Shaykh (R.A.) said: ‘. . . and it became a bird by virtue of the image of his sensory body’, and that is why, equally, Jesus (S.A.) said: ‘I shall create for you from mud that which resembles a bird.’ He said this with the letter *kaf* of resemblance, and he did not say: ‘I will create for you a bird from mud.’ Now, in the words ‘by the permission of God’ it is permissible that the word ‘*yakun*’, ‘become’, is the word that denotes the actor, but equally the word ‘blow’ is permissibly the actor, but the Shaykh (R.A.) prefers the first aspect, and the result will be under this consideration: and he blew into it something resembling made from mud, and it became by the semblance of blowing into it, by permission of God, a bird. Consequently, concerning the bird, the building by Jesus is conjectural, because at the level of Jesus’ blowing, that form into which it was blown became a bird by the permission of God. Thus, the relationship of that thing into which it was blown, to a bird, is by the permission and the order of God, and it is not the blowing of Jesus. Then the immanencing of the bird is not from Jesus. What was from Jesus was perhaps only the blowing, but according to the other probable aspect, when the actor in the words ‘by the permission of God’ is the blower, then under this consideration it is like this: and he blew into it by permission of God and it became a bird by virtue of the fact of its image of sensory body; thus that which relates to the becoming of a bird of that thing into which was blown, is Jesus’ blowing into it by the permission of God. Consequently, the creation of the bird resulted from Jesus’ blowing by the permission of God. The Divine permission for Jesus to blow thus is nothing other than God’s immanencing to him. That is to say, it is nothing other than bestowing on him the power for bringing into being an action which is exceptional,

in which case the way he did it being the action and the action emanating from him be not attributed to any other than God in common knowledge of action. God's immanencing to him is of the aspects and effects of the Names of the Ipseity with which Jesus was realized and with the collective effects of which he was manifested. Now, God's immanencing to Jesus is by the relationship of his special inclination which is by virtue of his known image and his established potentiality. Consequently, in the bringing to life and in the creation which emanated from Jesus, the aspects of conjecture and reality were collected together, and in fact conjecture and reality were collected in that thing in which Jesus' body was created. Everything is done in the way He said. And in the same way he cured the blind-born and the leper, and all that is attributed to him and to the permission of God, and the 'permission', as given by the scriptures, is similar to His word, 'by My permission' and 'by permission of God.' And in the same way, God's saying of Jesus that he cured the blind-born and the leper is according to reality and conjecture, and equally the totality of the things related to the miraculous things to Jesus and to the permission of God, and also to the words 'by My permission' and 'by the permission of God', and the things that are similar to the permission in the scriptures are all according to reality and conjecture. And if 'blowing' appertained to the genitive case it would be that the blower had the permission to blow and the bird would become from the blower by the permission of God. Thus, it would mean that due to the words 'by the permission of God' being in the genitive case and appertaining to the blowing, then the blower would be permitted to blow and the bird would result from the blower by God's permission, and this would be the aspect which is through the aspect of reality. And if it were said that the blower blew not due to the permission, it would be immanencing of the bird to fly by God's permission. If the blower, which is Jesus (S.A.), blew without the permission of God, then the thing which was created in the image of a bird would fly by the permission of God and the immanencing would be for the flyer. In other words, if it were at the level of blowing without permission, then the bird would be immanenced from its own self and this would be that Jesus created it from the aspect of conjecture, which would be that at the level of his blowing, the immanencing of the bird from his own self by the permission of God, and its creator in reality would be God who permitted the immanencing of that thing. That is as if that thing made, after flying by the permission of God, would declare that it was

immanenced and that would not be for Jesus. Equally, it would not be for God in accordance with the necessities of the Essential Will of God. It would rather be that God permitted to be immanenced and bestowed upon it being whereby it became immanenced through the receptivity and inclination that thing had in itself for being immanenced. Consequently, by demanding immanencing at the level of the permission of God, immanencing would be for it, and God bestowing upon him the permission of being, then immanencing under this consideration would again be for God, because at the level of the being of the blowing, the immanencing of the thing in its own self is dependent upon the Divine permission. It could also be interpreted in the following way: the immanencing of the bird could belong to the bird, and the flying of that thing made could be by the permission of God. And if the immanencing of the actor in this immanencing were not in the order of both conjecture and reality, this image would not have received the two aspects, but it has the two aspects because of what the emergence of Jesus bestows upon it. If indeed there had not been in the creation of Jesus conjecture from the side of Gabriel and reality from the side of Mary, this Jesus image would not have accepted the two aspects. That is to say, in his action there would not have manifested both conjecture and reality. However, it is rather that the two aspects are resultant for this image, because as the emergence of Jesus is due both to conjecture and reality it bestows both conjecture and reality. Or else, had there not been both conjecture and reality in the order of creation of Jesus, then this image, that is to say, the image of blowing into it and it becomes a bird by the permission of God, would not have accepted these two aspects. In other words, the words 'by the permission of God', which are in the genitive, would not be allowable to refer to the word 'become' and thereby would not refer to the word of 'blowing' and would not thereby be permissible to accept both aspects and would have accepted only one aspect. However, concerning this image two aspects are resultant because the emergence of Jesus bestows the two aspects which are conjecture and reality. Consequently, that which is according to his state exposes his action, an act which is the image of his state which accepted the two aspects.

And Jesus emerged in submissiveness, so that in his laws for his people to pay the tax they were submissive. And Jesus (S.A.) manifested at that degree from his mother the state of submissiveness, that her submissiveness resulted in him to such a degree that he made the law

for his people to pay the tax in all humility and submissiveness, in other words, that they pay their tax in submissiveness and show no resistance or animosity. The fact of Jesus being born from that state of submissiveness of his mother, and his coming out in submissiveness and his telling his people to give the tax, is in his first emergence when he appeared with the envoyship of law-giving and at the time of his giving the determinations of the law to his people when he emerged as law-giver. In his second emergence he will not descend in the state of his mother, to remove some of the qualities with which he was born from the state of his mother which do not have place in the Mohammedian collectivity, and will descend with the Divine natures and Mohammedian qualities, otherwise he would not have entered the circle of the complete totality of the Way of Mohammed (S.A.). However, it is necessary that Jesus in his second emergence make war against the *Dajjâl* and kill him. Consequently, his being born with the state of his mother, in submissiveness, is at the level of his ordering his people to pay the tax, and his descent with the Mohammedian nature in the second descent is at the level of his descent where he has to war with the *Dajjâl* and destroy him. If he had come again with submissiveness he could not have killed the *Dajjâl*. And equally, when he comes again he will not descend with a new law-giving and independent envoyship, but will follow the law-giving of the totality of the collectivity of the religion of the Envoy (S.A.), who is the regent of the intimate religion and possessor of law and way of action, and he will descend again, reviving the Mohammedian ways of action in accordance with the Mohammedian religion, and in his own sainthood and in consequence of Mohammedian religion and from the point of view of his viceregency he will remove some of the determinations, which are established through religious legal opinion of the individuals and which are ambiguous, which were at the time of the Envoy, and were not necessarily according to the determinations of the Envoy (S.A.). And that he removes some of the determinations is not outside the Mohammedian legality, because the veracity of the relationship of Jesus (S.A.) to the state of Mohammedian collectivity is through his entrance into the Mohammedian collectivity by taste and by state and through his branching out with its determinations, and by him God the High seals the determinations and the rule of the determinators in this religious way (*sharî'ah*). The commentator David of Caesarea says that at the time of Jesus' second coming, Jesus, due to his submissiveness born of his mother, will impose the tax on the

Christian people, just as the Envoy (S.A.) had done, but in his second coming Jesus (S.A.) will descend among the Mohammedian people, and the Christian people who will exist at that time are not his people and in his religious way so that through his humility he would impose on them the tax as his own people. It would mean that his past religious way was not erased by the religious way of the Envoy, so that there would be left of that in his second coming, so that Jesus by his past envoyship act independently among his own people and manifest with the old religious way. This order is impossible. What the Shaykh intends is to express that before the Mohammedian emergence when Jesus had emerged and was manifested in submissiveness due to the state of his mother, it was due to this submissiveness that he had imposed the giving of the tax, and the state of his mother was fluent in him and in his people. And when one of them was slapped on the face he should pose the other cheek so that it be slapped, and not to rise against it and not to demand retribution from him. This is to him from the aspect of his mother, because for the woman it is to be underneath, and for her it is the submissiveness because she is under the man by determination and by the senses. That is to say, Jesus being manifested with submission and that he should determine and show the way of non-rising and being submissive to his people is from the aspect of his mother, because for women the side of being under is established, therefore for her is established submission because the woman is under the man by nature and by determination, as in the words: 'Men rise above the women', and the words: 'Men have a degree, and the witnessing of a man is like two of the women.' Consequently, as the water of Mary is reality in the body of Jesus, in his bodily states submissiveness was the preponderant quality, just as in the women the qualities of submissiveness are preponderant due to their being naturally and by determination lower than the man, because the water of Mary is real and preponderant over the water of Gabriel which is conjectural. And that thing in him of the power of bringing to life and curing, it is from the aspect of the blowing of Gabriel (S.A.) in the image of Man. That is why Jesus (S.A.) revived the dead when he was in the image of Man. If Gabriel had not been in the image of a man and he had been in the image other than the images of the elements of the immanences such as an animal or plant or solid, Jesus (S.A.) would not have revived the dead unless he was dressed in such an image and manifested in that. This is because life for the spirits is essential because they are of the Breath of the *rahmān* and they carry

the Names of the *lâhût*, and to bring to life and to cure are of their particularities. However, Jesus (S.A.) used to bring to life the dead while he was clothed in the image of a man, because the image of Jesus is the result of such an image which Gabriel, while he blew into Mary and implanted (*ilqâ*) it, he was represented in that image. That is why at the time when the materia of the child is acted upon by the progenitor, the character and the form of the self which is dominant in the progenitor at the time becomes predominant over the child. That is why had Gabriel (S.A.) not come in the image of a man to Mary but had come in another image of the immanence, like animal, plant or solids, surely Jesus (S.A.) would not have resurrected the dead unless he was clothed in that image, because Jesus' resurrecting is the Angel Gabriel. Consequently, he does not resurrect except when he is clothed and manifest in the image in which Gabriel (S.A.) was represented when he implanted the Word in Mary. If Gabriel had come in his image of light which is outside the elements and the fundamentals, as he does not go outside his nature. If Gabriel (S.A.) had come in his natural light image as he is in the Lotus Tree of the Extreme Limit (*sidratu-l-muntahâ*), which image would be outside the elements and the fundamentals, yet Gabriel (S.A.) does not go beyond his light nature and does not exceed above his definite image which is in the Lotus Tree of the Extreme Limit, because his original image is not of the elements but it is natural and of light and is between the eighth and the seventh sphere (*falak*), and appears in his station in that original image and does not pretend to the image of Divine Light and image of the Names, but he becomes represented in all the images of the elements which are under his rule because Gabriel is the ruler of elements. It is of his powers that he can manifest in images of all the elements which are in the seventh heaven and below that. He manifests in whichever image of the images of the elements he desires by virtue of domain and station and by virtue of the aptitudes of the people of each station. Then Jesus would not have brought to life except when he appeared in that same image of the nature of light, not elemental with the human image from the side of his mother, which means that Jesus could not have resurrected the dead unless he manifested in the image of the nature of light, and he could not have resurrected clothed in his human image from the side of his mother because his resurrecting is by virtue of his manifesting in the image in which Gabriel was at the time he blew. Consequently, had it not been like this, he could not have resurrected unless he was manifested with

the image of the natural light of Gabriel. Consequently, it is without a doubt, where it concerns resurrecting, that he should be in the image of Gabriel and his mother which is his origin, and that he be not outside of the human image and his total nature. As he does not go outside his nature they would have said of him when he brought to life the dead: 'He is not he', and the person who saw him would have gone into perplexity (*hayrah*). Thus Jesus (S.A.) had manifested with the natural image of light from the side of Gabriel and in the image of the human from the side of his mother. When it came to reviving the dead they would have said of Jesus that from the aspect of his mother Mary where he is in the image of a human being, he is Jesus, yet he is not Jesus due to the aspect of Gabriel's natural image of light. In other words, he could not have been determined independently by one of the images, and the person who saw it would have fallen into perplexity, because when he would have seen him in the image of a man he would say he is Jesus, and when he would have looked at the natural image of light he would say it is not Jesus. As it happened in the intelligent person when he reflected on this, when he saw a human person from among the human beings resurrecting the dead and that is of the Divine specialities, the reviving of the speech and not the reviving of the animates, he remained looking at it completely perplexed that he saw a human image with Divine effects. This is to say that when one looked at Jesus one would go into perplexity, as it happened that the intelligent person at the level of reflective vision fell into perplexity. When an intelligent person from among the humankind saw a human person resurrecting the dead, with the reviving of the speech and not with the reviving of the animates, whereas the reviving of the dead is of Divine speciality, the intelligent onlooker would remain in perplexity because he would have seen a human being manifested as clothed with Divine effects. That is to say, if they saw a human person manifesting with the reviving of the dead, which is of Divine speciality, who revived the dead by speech, that is to say, by saying to them: 'Rise alive by God', or 'by the permission of God' or 'by the Name of God', and that the dead came alive with speech and prayer and they spoke to him, and the dead also answered him in what he had spoken to them about, that is to say, the dead answered in whatever subject he made the dead speak, and the dead responded with '*labbayka*' to his interrogation, the people of reflective vision would remain completely perplexed. Thus, as he revives the dead with speech, in the same way this dead becomes alive with speech.

Consequently, he brings him alive. However, only with that amount of life during which he speaks, so having spoken he returns back to his original state, but this means that he does not revive him with the revival of the animate so that he walks and eats and that he lives a length of life and remains for that period. It is known that in the story of Jesus it happened that Jesus (S.A.) revived Sam bin Noah with his speech. Thus, having witnessed his prophethood, he (Sam bin Noah) returned to his original state. That is to say, there was life manifested in him during that period of speech. Thus, revival by speech of the inanimate, for their speech, it is like the revival of the inanimate so that after their conversation they return back to the image of the inanimate. Thus, the life of the dead which speak is also like this. Consequently, the intelligent became utterly perplexed that the human image clothed in Divine effect manifests in reviving the dead. The Shaykh said 'a human person', after which he added 'from among the human beings', because the intelligent would not have fallen into utter perplexity had it been that the Angel, which is not a human being, was represented in the image of a human being and revived the dead, because life is essential spirits. The reason why the intelligent people were perplexed when they saw the revival of the dead coming from a human person is the fact that they were perplexed because they saw Jesus (as a person) reviving the dead. And some of them were led in this through the words of endosmose (*hulûl*) and that he is certainly God when he revives the dead, which means that some thought when they saw Jesus reviving the dead that God had endosmosed into the human image of Jesus, and they said: 'Jesus is God', because he brought the dead to life and bringing the dead to life is of Divine speciality. Thus they related the revival of the dead to God whom they thought was indwelling in the image of Jesus. And by this they related to *kufr* (covering up of the Truth) and this was covering because they covered God who (they thought) was reviving in the human image of Jesus, because in fact they covered God who revives the dead with the human image of Jesus, and conjectured that God had endosmosed into that image, and that image is His real image. Thus the God who is manifest in Jesus and in all the places of manifestation with the revelation of the universal revelation, they individuated Him solely in Jesus and covered Him up with it, and from the aspect of individuation they said: 'God is Jesus.' These words are the words of the beginnings of the Nestorian sect. God the High said concerning those who have covered

the Truth like this: 'They said that God is he who is Messiah, son of Mary', and they collected together error and *kufr* with completely all of these words, not only by their words 'He is God', and not only by their words 'son of Mary'. They united between the error and the *kufr* because they said that 'God is he', and by saying 'God is he' they attributed the quiddity of Jesus to God, because in fact the quiddity of Jesus is the Quiddity of God which is revealed in being with all the quiddity of the universe; equally by saying that that was the son of Mary they joined error with *kufr*, because Jesus is the son of Mary. In fact perhaps rather that by confining the Quiddity of the *haqq* to the Messiah, son of Mary, and conjecturing God's endosmose therein, the error and *kufr* is in the combination of placing by positing the Quiddity of God in the image of the son of Mary, so they erred by placing God therein. Again, they were in *kufr* by clothing the *haqq* in the image of Jesus' humanity, because the Person of the Oneness of the *haqq* is far removed and transcended from being circumscribed or conditioned by any one independent existing thing and His indwelling in it other than His own Being. From the point of view of Him bringing the dead to life, they deviated by comprising God in the human terrestrial image by their words 'son of Mary', and he is indeed without a doubt the son of Mary, but the one who heard them (imagined that they) related the Divinity to that which is imaged and made it the same as the image, but they did not do this; rather, they made the Divinity of the Divine the subject of the human image which is the son of Mary, and they separated the image from the determination. There is transposition in the words of these sentences. It would be as if it were said: they deviated in that they comprised God in the human terrestrial image where it concerned bringing into life of the dead. Thus, some of the Christian peoples who believed in endosmose deviated from God to the human terrestrial image due to the words 'son of Mary', by comprising God in the image of the son of Mary by virtue of God the High reviving the dead in the piece of manifestation of the son of Mary, or even by virtue of the fact that the son of Mary revived the dead. Thus, because there was manifested revival of the dead from the human image of Jesus they comprised God into that, and they deviated from the Absolute Divinity by comprising, not by making it explicit, and they confined Divinity to that and said: 'It is the son of Mary', whereas without a doubt Jesus is the son of Mary, yet the hearer imagined that in fact those who spoke of endosmose related the Divinity to the image of Jesus and they made Him the same

as the image which was, however, the human image for Jesus, whereas they related Divinity to the image and made it the same as the image. Rather that they enclosed the Divine Quiddity in the subject of the human image, which image was the son of Mary. Thus they differentiated between the determination which was Divine according to that image and the image of Jesus, the Messiah, by that word 'He is' which is for differentiation, and they made of the determination the same thing as the image. In other words, they determined over the image of the Messiah and made that image the same as the determination. It is also possible that here the word 'determination' may be used to mean 'determined upon', because with Divinity in the verset in the words God is determined upon and the Messiah is determined by, that is to say, between the Messiah image and that which is determined upon by that image, which is God, which they differentiated with the words 'He is' and they attributed the terrestrial nature to the quiddity and posited God with that quiddity by attributing the image to it, but they did not make the image of Jesus the same as that which determined upon which is God. Thus, they limited the Divine Quiddity and confined it to a specific image from the terrestrial images. However, God is not circumscribed in any image. Thus they erred in the consideration which conjectured circumscription, because the hearer thought that they said: 'God is he, the image of Jesus', but they differentiated and discriminated and said: 'God is in the image of Jesus', which means that God is in endosmose in the image of Jesus, son of Mary. Thus they combined error with covering up (*kufr*) by saying: 'God is he, the Messiah', because they confined and covered the Divine form by it in Jesus, which they did by saying: 'God is in Jesus', and also 'the son of Mary', whereas in fact God, the Truth, is the same as all, without limit and without circumscription and without being some of an indefinite substance, or a portion. Rather, He is Absolute in His Ipseity from all relativity and all absolutizing. There is no other with Him. There is not even a place for Him into which He could enter through endosmose, and no being other than Him so that it could relativize Him and make Him circumscribed. Gabriel was already in the form of a man and he had not blown. Afterwards he blew, and differentiated between the image and the blowing, and the blowing was from the image which already was, but not 'yet' the blowing, and the blowing is not, in point of fact, essentially (from the image). They had endosmosed the Divine Quiddity in the human image, thus they had differentiated between the image and the

determination. However, Gabriel (S.A.) was in the image of a man when he appeared to Mary, yet the blowing was not present. Afterwards he blew, thus Gabriel differentiated between the blowing and the image. Even though the blowing emanated from the image, the image did exist when the blowing was not yet in existence. Thus the blowing is not of the essence of the image, which means that when Gabriel manifested in the human image he blew after a while, thus he differentiated between manifesting with an image and blowing. Under this consideration, differentiation becomes established for the actor. Consequently, just as the image without blowing was really existing, in the same way the Divine Quiddity was really existing before the Jesus image. In the same way, the Jesus image was really existing before the resuscitation of the dead which belongs to Divinity. Consequently, the Jesus image is not essential for the Divine Quiddity as it was really existing before him, and equally, resuscitation, which belongs to the Divinity, is not essential for the Jesus image as Jesus existed before resuscitation manifested from him. There came to be a difference of opinion among the people of nations concerning the quiddity of Jesus. Those who looked at it from the point of view of the human mankind image said: 'He is the son of Mary.' Those who looked at it from the point of view as represented in the human image, related him to Gabriel, and those who looked at it from the point of view of what emanated from him concerning the resuscitation of the dead relate him to God through the Spirit and say: 'He is the Spirit of God', that is to say, life manifested when he blew into it. At one instance God is conjectured in Jesus in the objective case. At another instance the Angel is conjectured in him, and in another instance yet, the human man is conjectured in him. Thus, in each point of view Jesus is according to what is predominant in their belief. It is due to these three different considerations which exist in reality in Jesus that people differed in what they thought was the quiddity of Jesus. However, and he is the Word of God, and he is the Spirit of God and he is the servant of God. Thus, as people believed, Jesus is equally the Word of God because Gabriel blew into Mary the Word of God, Jesus is the Spirit of God because he resuscitated the dead, and Jesus is the servant of God because he is in the human mankind image. And there is not another one like this in the image of the human senses. That is to say, other than Jesus these three considerations do not exist among the human beings, and the words that came about concerning Jesus have not come about for any one other person because Jesus was immianenced

without a father by the blowing of the trustworthy Spirit. Equally, acts which are of Divine particularity emanated from him, and through this aspect it is that it is due to his body that he is the Spirit of God. He was called by the Spirit of God and the Word of God before the trustworthy Spirit and before he resuscitated the dead. 'From God and His Word that he (the Angel) implanted in Mary.' Consequently, Gabriel implanted into Mary through blowing, the Divine Spirit and the Divine Word, and that he was the Divine Spirit and the Word of God has been pointed out before this. The reason why the Shaykh says 'image of the senses' and conditions it to the image of the senses when he talks of him as 'in the image of the human senses' is because in the spiritual images everyone is the Spirit of God, and in the images of the Names equally, everyone is a word of God. Yet every person is related to the image of his progenitor, not to the one who blows His Spirit into the human image, because in fact when God arranged the human body, as He said, He arranged it and blew into it, He, the High, from His own Spirit, and related it to Himself, and He related the Spirit in his immanence and in his 'ayn to Himself, the High. Perhaps rather that each person is related to the image of his progenitor in his human image and his spirit is not related to the blower, because in fact God the High, when He arranged the human body, just as He said He had arranged it, God the High blew of His own Spirit in that body. Thus the High God related to Himself the Spirit which is blown into that arranged body, in its immanence and its 'ayn, that is, in its image. That is to say, God the High blows His Spirit into the body of each person after He has arranged the image of his body. For instance, just as He arranged the body of Adam from mud, and just as He has arranged the images of his (Adam's) descendants in the womb of the mother, He blows His Spirit into them after He arranged the body. Thus, in the being and in the 'ayn of that body the Divine Spirit is related to the High who blew, but his body which exists before arrangement and his person which exists after the blowing is not related to the *haqq* who blew but is related to the image of his parent, because the image of each person is the image of the state of the image of its parent, where the Spirit manifests by virtue of that state and is particularized and individuated therein. But Jesus is not like that, that He arranged the body and the human image and then blew His Spirit into it. It is different like we have mentioned, and there is not any similar to it. It is such that Jesus' creation is not like this. That is to say, the materia of his body was not existent

before the blowing of the Spirit so that it could be arranged, and so that after arranging the Spirit could be blown into it, because verily the state is such that the arrangement of the body and the human image of Jesus (S.A.) was in the blowing of the Spirit, that is to say, it was included in the blowing of the trustworthy Spirit. Consequently, the materia of his 'body was not existent before the blowing of the Spirit and his body was not called as such. Other than Jesus, which in fact we have mentioned, there never was anything similar to it, because the body of the others was arranged and present before the blowing, and the Spirit was blown into them after the arrangement of the body, as God says: 'Which I have arranged and then blew into it of My Spirit.' The arrangement of Jesus' body and his human image were included in the blowing of the Spirit, because Jesus' image was immanenced by the blowing of the trustworthy Spirit. Thus his materia of the body was carried in the blowing, and his body is represented and embodied in the meaning of the materia of the humidity which was blown into his body, and his bodily being and his spiritual being are the same, and there is no differentiation between the two and there are not even two different considerations of time or priority or otherwise. Now let it be known like this, that the Shaykh (R.A.), having exposed in accordance with the necessities of the manifestation the differences of Jesus over the other existents, according to the necessities of manifestation and according to the source of the people who envision when they look at Jesus, goes on to explain that although Jesus is definitely the Word of God, as according to the Mohammedian taste all that exists can only be the Word of God. And the existents, all of them, are the words of God which are without end and that they are from the Word 'Be' (*kun*) and 'Be' is the Word of God. Thus the existents become the words of God because they are the images of His words. The Shaykh (R.A.) says in chapter 198 of his *Futûhât*: 'Know that the existents, they are the words of God which are beyond end. God the High says in the being of Jesus (S.A.) that he is the Word which was implanted in Mary, and that is Jesus (S.A.), and because of that we say the existents are the words of God from the point of view of the proof of hearing, and if everybody does not believe us, we protest that this is Divine explanation and *kashf*', and ends his words. However, for the Word '*kun*' to be word for God is according to two considerations. One consideration is this, that the Being of the *ḥaqq* by virtue of His Absolute Reality manifests in the image of the Word '*kun*', and by that virtue the Word

'*kun*' is related to God. The other consideration is this, that God, descending from His Absolute Reality into the image of the person which is individuated or particularized by the word '*kun*', becomes individuated as the '*ayn*', and according to this consideration the word '*kun*' be the same as the image. Thus the Shaykh (R.A.), taking into consideration these two aspects, says as a question: Can the Word be related to Him by virtue of that which He is? That is to say, questioning, he says: Can the Word '*kun*' be related to God the High by virtue of that transcendence whereupon the *ḥaqq* is in reality? Thus, if according to this consideration, if the Word '*kun*' can be related to the *ḥaqq*, then that which He is (*mâhiyyah*) cannot be known. Thus, that which the Word is cannot be understood because it is the Absolute Word of the *ḥaqq* which is absolute in its reality, and the Word of the *ḥaqq* is the same as His Ipseity, and the Reality of the Ipseity is not known by any one of the human beings, because the Ipseity of the *ḥaqq* destroys all plurality of individuations. There is not the existence of one in It. By virtue of the Ipseity, generality and things known are the Being of the One *ḥaqq*. Thus, the reality of the Word which is related to Him is left alone in the state of Absoluteness. Thus, this Word is a Word of the Unknowable. Or does God the High come down in the image of the one who says '*kun*'? That is to say, does the Quiddity of the *ḥaqq* descend from His Absolute Reality by revelation to the image of the person who says the word '*kun*', so that by virtue of that individuated image it can be related to the *ḥaqq* due to the descending of the *ḥaqq*? If one considers that the speaking image is the descent of the *ḥaqq*, then it becomes (*fayakun*), and the word '*kun*' becomes the reality of that image into which He had descended and manifested therein, which means that for that image into which God had descended and therein manifested, the word '*kun*' becomes the same as that person and is related to him. In other words, if God descends into an image from among the images of the immanence and manifests therein, the word '*kun*' which emanates from that image becomes the same as that image and becomes the same as the *ḥaqq* who has manifested in that image and has particularized in that image. In consideration of manifesting from that image whence the word '*kun*' emanated, it is the *ḥaqq*. Under other grammatical considerations it is as if it were said: if God descends into the image of someone who says 'Be' and it becomes, then the word 'Be' becomes the same as that image, and under this consideration the Word becomes the Word of becoming. Some of the gnostics believe one

side of it, and the others believe another side of it, and some of them are in perplexity in this order and do not understand. Thus, some of the gnostics believe in one side of this, under which consideration they say the individuation is the same as the individuated, and the individuated is the same as the reality of the absolute non-individuation and is in transcendence. The other gnostics who believe in the other way say the *ḥaqq*, the High, descended from transcendence through individuation and He has become individuated by that individuation. Thus, in the mystery of individuation that which is individuated due to the Being of the *ḥaqq* in individuation becomes the same as the individuation; and some of the gnostics, not seeing the possibility of preferring one more than the other of these sides, remain in perplexity in this order, that is to say, they are in perplexity to know to what is related the Word '*kun*' and do not know how to determine by which of these aspects and how to prefer one aspect to another so as to relate it to that, and this perplexity is the great perplexity which is for the great ones among the saints. However, the people of completeness from among the Mohammedians, they are not in perplexity. Perhaps rather that they speak of the two different considerations and orders, and, as it has been mentioned, the two orders are verified in each '*ayn*', and this taste is of the way of drinking of the Seal and is special to the Seals which are Mohammedian. And this question is not possibly knowable except by taste, like Abu Yazid when he blew on the ant which he had killed and which he brought to life and knew in this by whom he blew when he blew. He was of the calling of Jesus. This means, like Abu Yazid's knowledge of this question through taste (*dhawq*), without taste the knowing of this question is impossible. This refers to when Abu Yazid killed an ant and then blew on it and the ant came alive. Thus, at the level of resuscitation Abu Yazid knew by taste by whom he blew, and then he blew and resuscitated it. Thus Abu Yazid was of the calling of Jesus, that is to say, he was in accordance with the taste of Jesus, having taken from the spirituality of Jesus, or perhaps, taking it from the Mohammedian taste which is in accordance with the taste of Jesus. The knowledge of resuscitation of the dead and how is the relationship to God of this resuscitation in the servant, or the knowledge of how this is related to the person who has blown by God, these knowledges cannot happen except by taste. Thus, a person who does not resuscitate the dead like Jesus, or come to life after being dead like Ezra, cannot know by taste how the resuscitation is, because how these things are

done is only known by taste and cannot be known by explanation, because explanation only results in imagination, and imagination is not enough in understanding the realities, especially in understanding how things are done, because how things are done is not known except by taste and consciousness, just as the taste of an event cannot be understood except by taste. As for the spiritual resuscitation, this is by knowledge. That is to say, resuscitation of the senses and of the bodies by which Jesus is manifested is by means of blowing, but the spiritual resuscitation which resuscitates the heart and the *nafs* which is dead with ignorance, that results by means of Divine knowledge. And such (resuscitation which results from spiritual resuscitation) is Divine Essential life of light of knowledge, which is, as God the High has said in that matter: 'Or the one who was dead and We brought him to life, and We brought to him light by which he walks among people.' And all those who have resurrected their dead *nafs* with the life of knowledge in this matter particularly appertaining to the knowledge of God, they are certainly resuscitated by it, and for them there is light by which they walk among people, like among forms which have images. Thus, life which results from spiritual resuscitation is the Divine Essential life of light of knowledge. That is to say, he who is alive by knowledge is alive by the Divine Essential life of the light of knowledge, and concerning this life, God said: And the one who was dead through ignorance, We brought him to life with the life of knowledge, and We brought to him light, and that is knowledge, with which he walks among people, and they understand by it that which there is in their aptitude. Thus, any person who revives with the life of knowledge a *nafs* which is dead with ignorance in the special matter which appertains to the knowledge of God, that person certainly resuscitates that person with that matter, and that matter or question becomes light for him with which he walks among the people, that is to say, he walks among the people who are in image in his form. That is to say, knowledge which is spiritual life which is particular to the *nafs* which are high and knowledgeable in God, is Essential Divine life of light of knowledge which God the High bestowed upon His *awliyâ*' and the complete ones of the purest kind, so that they resuscitate those *nafs* with the aptitude from death through ignorance, and effuses upon them the light of the life of the light of knowledge so that their lives are resuscitated with the life of light, and in that way they walk among the people who are of their own form and they understand the intentions and states and the aptitudes which

are in effect in their interior and in their action and in their works. Each knowledge cannot resuscitate a *nafs* which is dead with the death of ignorance. Perhaps rather it be only the knowledge of God which refers to the acts of God, to God the High Himself, and to His Qualities and to His Names and His signs (*âyât*) and His words. Thus, each of the complete saints who are alive with the Essential Divine life of light and are realized by it, resuscitates anyone who demands because he has the aptitude, who is dead through the death of ignorance concerning a knowledge of God in which particular question he had no knowledge, with the life of light of knowledge. Then he resuscitates him certainly with the life of eternal knowledge so that ignorance never again attaches itself to him.

The reason why he (the Shaykh) explained the words: ' . . . among the people' with the words: ' . . . in the form of his image' is this, that those who are similar to him and in his form in his image, are not necessarily in their nature similar to him or in his form. Rather, they are people who are dead through ignorance, because otherwise the vocabulary meaning of 'people' appertains both to the dead and the alive and the lacking and the complete. And the wisdom why the Divine knowledge is made light for them is this, that just as his own life has become alive with Divine knowledge, he equally walks among the people with the light of vision and the light of understanding, and being resuscitated from death of ignorance to the life of Divine knowledge he will equally revive those who have in them the aptitude, because God the High from all eternity and forever wants to be cognized and worshipped and known and witnessed, and this is without a doubt from the places of manifestation of the purest ones and the saints whose selves have been resuscitated with the life of Divine knowledge and thus their hearts have been enlightened with the Divine light. The Shaykh (R.A.) has conditioned the life which results due to knowledge with the word 'Divine', because the life which is individuated in the Presence of Divinity is the uniqueness of the collectivity of life which is singularly individuated from the Presences of the totality of the Divine Names, and he qualified this with 'Essential' (of the Ipseity) because both 'Knowledge' and 'Life' are of the Qualities of the Ipseity, and 'Alive' and the 'Knower' are of the Names of the Ipseity. At the degree of Uniqueness these are the same as the Ipseity. He also qualified it with 'of knowledge', because Knowledge is the most honoured of the Divine Qualities, and the Divine and immanential realities are manifest

by virtue of knowledge through His Knowledge. Rather perhaps that He manifests them due to knowledge. He also qualified it with 'light' because of knowledge, because it is through knowledge that the inexistent things of the Unknowable are manifested, because light is that thing which is manifested through its own self and manifests equally that which is other, and it is the interior spiritual light which results through the above-mentioned Qualities which are of the Qualities of the Divine perfection. Being alive through the life of knowledge is higher, more honoured and more total than the life of the senses, because resuscitation with the life of knowledge is the resuscitation of the *nafs* and of the spirits to which non-existence (*fanā'*) never attaches, whereas all those that are resuscitated with life of the senses are subject to non-existence. However, in the general *nafs* resuscitation of the senses also happens because it has to do with the senses and it is a Divine particularity. Thus the order which is arranged according to the Divine Ability, when observed through the senses its effects are more numerous, and thus the generality only knows the life of the world, because the power of the *himmah* of the prophets and envoys is to save the human emergence by resuscitating the spirits of the people of the humankind with the life of the light of knowledge, and the facing and the *himmah* of their people and their subjects is also to turn away from the earthly life and to become alive with the life of the interior meaning and the eternal spiritual life. Thus, in the complete ones who are people of ability, having an appreciation of interior spiritual life, its happening is more numerous, and as they have little inclination to revival of the senses, the occurrence of that is much less. Now, as the Shaykh (R.A.) explained both the resuscitation of the senses and the resuscitation of the interior spiritual meaning, and as the resuscitation of the resuscitated is through that which is his receptivity to be resuscitated, consequently he points to the resuscitation of the interior spiritual meaning, that God the High resuscitates with the Breath of the *rahmān* their inexistent *a'yān* which are dead with the death of non-existence, and points equally to the fact that for this it is necessary in the thing which is non-existent to have both a receptivity to being and the one who brings into being.

**Had it not been for Him, and had it not been for us, that
which is would not have been that which is.**

This is to say, had there not been the Absolute Uniqueness of Ipseity, or otherwise, had there not been His Essential revelation, together with

the *nafs-ar-raḥmân*, to manifest from their uniqueness in annihilation in the Presence of Oneness the Divine Names and Lordly Qualities, and equally, had there not been our established potentialities (*a'yân*) which were established in the non-existence (*'adam*), which are receptive of the *nafs-ar-raḥmân*, there would not have been the realization of the Names and the Qualities in the Presence of Oneness. In the same way, had there not been the revelations of the effects of His Lordly Names and the active Qualities of necessarily-so-ness and the Being of the *ḥaqq* to bring into being the established potentialities of immanence, and equally, had there not been our total reality of the completeness of servanthood and the effectively established potentialities of being acted upon which are receptive of the Being of the *ḥaqq* and His active revelation, then coming into being and the immanences and the showing of the established potentialities would not have been. Thus we, with our establishing the Divinity and our servanthood and our establishing of the Lordship, bring into manifestation the fact that He is the Possessor of Names and Qualities, and His Names and Qualities. He, on the other hand, through Divinity and Lordship, effuses being over our established potentialities and over the totality of immanences. Equally, He effuses being over such acts as are truly attributable to the *ḥaqq* by one aspect, and truly attributable to us from another aspect. Thus, without a doubt there is the Being of the *ḥaqq* in the manifestation of the revelations of the Names of actions and in the coming into being of the established potentialities of the immanence. This is equally so where it concerns our effected receptive established potentialities. Another aspect is this, that without the consideration of the *ḥaqq* descending from His Uniqueness of Ipseity to Oneness, and that the Names and Qualities were not realized in Him and our potentialities were not established, then the Names and Qualities and the totality of the potentialities of the possibilities would have been annihilated in the Ipseity of Uniqueness, and there would not have come into being manifestation and manifesting of the immanence, because immanencing and bringing into being happens by redoubling (making into two) in the Oneness. In the Uniqueness there is neither immanencing nor bringing into being. 'As there does not out of One except the One, and from the immanence One.' That is why the being of Jesus happened between two, and of two waters, and it did not happen only from Gabriel and his conjectural water, and it did not happen only from Mary and her real water.

**And we are in reality the servants of the *ḥaqq*, and indeed
God is our Master.**

That is, the totality of the *a'yân* of being speak in their language that in reality we are the servants of the *ḥaqq*, being the place of manifestation of a specific Lord from among the Divine Names, and we worship Him with that, and God the Great disposes the order of each one of us by virtue of that Name. And the established potentialities of the most complete ones which are realized through the oneness of the Divine collectivity, in their speech say: we are in reality the servants of the *ḥaqq* because we worship Him with the essential worship, that is to say, being the place of manifestation of the collectivity of the Names of the Uniqueness of the Ipseity, and in consideration that that collectivity is manifested in us, we are Its servants by virtue of that collectivity, and the Lordship of all the Names which are intrinsic in the collectivity of the Names being in general effective in us, and, on the other hand, He effecting upon us specially the totality of Lordship of that collectivity, we are under the dominion of the Lordship which is both general and specific and we are His servants in accordance with both aspects. He equally is our Master with the totality of the Divine Names and with the collectivity of the Essential Uniqueness, and He is our *waliyy* and the one that we establish as *waliyy*, and He is the disposer of our order.

**And we are the same as Him. Know this when you have
said 'Mankind'.**

When you say to us 'Mankind', that is, you name us with the Name 'Mankind' which is the place of manifestation of His Essential Oneness and the image of the collectivity of the Divine Names, then indeed we are the same as the *ḥaqq*, and be you knowledgeable in this way, because the place of manifestation of the perfection of Mankind is the same in reality as the *ḥaqq* who has created Adam according to His own image, because he is commensurate with the measure and extent of the *ḥaqq*, and he has no measure or extent to his definition so that the *ḥaqq* should manifest in accordance with that measure. Consequently, the *ḥaqq* manifests in his image with all His absolute manifestability in the image of the collectivity of His Essential Oneness, and in the measure of the transcendence of His potentiality (*'ayn*) and with His *la ta'ayyun*, and He is not altered by being there. Consequently, he is the same as the *ḥaqq*, and the *ḥaqq* is the same as him. However, that which is other

things than the Perfect Man, they are not the same as Him, because even though God is the same as all and the same as each 'ayn, yet His manifesting in each 'ayn and His revealing Himself in each 'ayn is according to the measure of the 'ayn, not in accordance to the image of His Absolute Ipseity, because they are the places of manifestation of some of the Divine Names. Thus, the *haqq* does not reveal Himself to them in the image of His Ipseity. Consequently, from the aspect of God's manifesting in them to the measure of each 'ayn, God is the same as each 'ayn, and this is allowable to say, but to say each 'ayn is the same as the *haqq* is not allowable, not true, except for the Perfect Man, the Complete Man, where the *haqq* is the same as him as he is the same as the *haqq*.

Do not be veiled by Mankind. In fact, he bestows upon you proof.

That is to say, the Perfect Complete Man is the total place of manifestation and is manifested with the Divine image. 'We did not expand the earth nor the heavens, but We expanded the heart of the believing servant.' The heart is the place of manifestation of the revelation of the Divine Ipseity. In the same way, the Complete Man is manifested with the qualities of immanence. God created Man with both His Hands. His right Hand is the Divine Qualities, His left Hand is the qualities of the immanence. Thus Man is manifested according to two images, and is the isthmus between the Sea of Necessarily-ness and the Sea of Possibilities. Thus, the line above comes to mean: do not be veiled by seeing the individuation of a man in the image of a human being, and do not be veiled from the One Being of the *haqq* which is revealed and manifested there. In the same way, even though Man by his personality is a letter of the generality and is a Name from among the Names of the immanence, yet in reality he is the Name of God in consideration of the fact that the *haqq*, the High, is the same as the degrees of being and the established potentialities, because the *haqq*, in consideration of being the same as Man, is the same as the universes, and not in consideration of the fact that He is the Lord and the Divinity, because the Divinity is always the Divinity and not the established Divinity, and the Lord is always the Lord, not established as Lord, and Man, being the isthmus between the Sea of Lordship and the Sea of establishment of Lordship, is the same as the two seas. Consequently, because Mankind is a Name of immanence, do not let

it veil you from the fact that it is a Divine Name. Thus, Mankind has bestowed on you a proof which guides you to the *ḥaqq*. In other words, he exposed to you that Man, by his grandest collectivity and the greatest isthmuseity, is the most explicit proof of the *ḥaqq* and His most manifest proof. Thus, looking at Man's human image and his quality of possibilities, do not be veiled from the *ḥaqq* which is manifested in him.

**Be the *ḥaqq* and be the immanence (*khalq*), you will be
by God the *rahmân*.**

The Shaykh (R.A.), having expressed the high degree of the Perfect Complete Man, addresses the Perfect Complete Man which collects between Divinity and Lordship and establishment of Lordship, and whose exterior is *khalq* and whose interior is *ḥaqq*, and goes on to say: by virtue of your mankindness and your isthmuseity it is possible for you to be the same as the *ḥaqq* by virtue of reality, since by virtue of your reality all the collectivity of the Divine Names are present by your presence. It is possible for you to be the same as the immanence in consideration of your human image. Thus, by your nature and creaturality all the realities and potentialities are present. In other words, be the *ḥaqq* through your reality, or be the *khalq* by your creaturality and humanity, and when you are expanded to the *ḥaqq* and the *khalq* by your isthmuseity, because of the manifestation of the degree of Divinity in you, you become the *rahmân* to the totality of the *khalq* by virtue of the generality of your being and the expanse of your *rahmah*. As in the verse before he warned you not to be veiled from the high quality that he argued for Mankind, he concluded the height and value of Mankind in this stanza, that is to say, that Man collects the *ḥaqq* and the *khalq* and by his reality is the *rahmân* to the totality of the *a'yân* and immanences.

**Nourish His creation from Him. Thus you become refresh-
ing repose and sweet scent.**

Let it be known like this, that the *ḥaqq* by Its Being is the nourishment of the creation, because being is through the *ḥaqq*, and the presence and continuation and the life of the creation is like such a nourishment by which the one that is fed is present and continuing and alive. At the same time, the creation is the nourishment of the *ḥaqq* in the manifesting of the determinations of the Names and Qualities, because these are realized through creation. Thus, the Names are realized by the known

and unknown potentialities, and the determinations of the Names are manifested through the potentialities of immanence. Consequently, as the Being of the *ḥaqq* is manifested in complete perfection in the being of the Complete Man and is realized by it, addressing it he (the Shaykh) says: Give nourishment to the creation of the *ḥaqq* from the *ḥaqq*, that is to say, give nourishment to the totality of the creation by the Being of the *ḥaqq*, taking it from Him and giving it to them. Because you are the Viceregent and the intimate person of God in the bestowal of nourishment to the creation, under these considerations you become the refreshing tranquillity and repose for the immanential realities which are in the care and the anxiety of suffering in the narrowness of non-existence, to which you give repose by the Being of the *ḥaqq* and you revive and refresh them with the Ancient Light from the darkness of non-being, and equally you become the pleasant aroma for the universes: 'And it could not be that God would torment them and that you be among them', and: 'There does not come the Hour as long as it is said upon the earth "*Allāh Allāh*" and that there is the Perfect Man in it who rememorates *Allāh* the High according to His Reality.' It could also mean: you would be the sweet scent for the Being of the *ḥaqq* with the sweet breath of immanential creaturality and the emergence of the images of the possibilities, because the existence of the Perfect Complete Man becomes the manifested manifestations of aromatic breath which are effectively in the immanential potentialities and images of the possible through the breath of sweetness, and the Lordly revelations which are dependent on his existence are revealed through him.

We gave Him that with which He began, which was in us,
and He gave

When the Divine Names were realized in the Presence of Knowledge, and their consequent manifestation with their determinations and effects was realized by virtue of the receptivity of the receptive potentialities due to their essential aptitude, which were in the state of the servant in their state of establishment in the *a'yān* and then were manifested, then, again, as the manifesting of the *ḥaqq* according to a special aspect in the potentialities is due to the potentialities, and as the beings of the potentialities after revelation is due to the *ḥaqq*, the Shaykh (R.A.) says: We gave to the *ḥaqq* that thing by which the *ḥaqq* manifested in us due to our aptitude to receive, and equally, due to our receptivity which we bestowed upon the *ḥaqq*, the *ḥaqq* bestowed existence to us.

**And the order became partitioned between His side and
our side**

Thus the order of being, according to the considerations of intellect, became divided into two parts, one part of which is our giving Him, which is the giving of aptitude and state according to which we were established when we were established in non-existence, and the second part is His giving, which is bestowal of being and the bestowal of the superiorities and perfections and completions which are the necessities of being in accordance with the condition of our potentialities.

**And He gave life to that which He knew by my inside (by
that which was hidden inside me which He knew
through my interior) when He gave life.**

That is to say, the manifestation of the images of completion and perfection of the Divine collectivity which are within the powers of the Perfect and Complete Man, is dependent upon the resulting of the complete aptitude and the width of receptivity of the Man. 'And when I have arranged it I blew into it of My Spirit': the images of the collectivities of the Names which before the arrangement were in him in effect, which were in torment, became released from torment at the level of manifesting resulting from the arrangement. Thus the Shaykh (R.A.) says: that Absolute Being who knows the *ḥaqq* in my reality, in my potentiality, that is to say, in my interior, in my heart, with the totality of the images of His Names; that is to say, He witnesses it in the aptitude of my reality, vivifies and manifests the *ḥaqq* with the totality of His images which were in me in effect and in power at the time when He vivified me. That is to say, the Being of the Absolute *ḥaqq* does not become witnessed and recognized except at the level of the manifestation with His image at the place of manifestation of the Perfect Complete Man. Thus, before arrangement the images of the Divine Names were in the power of the aptitude of Man. When He wanted to manifest them and when He wanted to be recognized and witnessed, He arranged the body and the being of the Man, and vivifying him with the blowing of the Spirit of revelation He vivifies him by manifesting the image of the *ḥaqq* which is in his interior, and becomes recognized and witnessed by it.

Another aspect is this: the realization and manifestation of the Divine Names depend upon the manifestation and realization of the receptive

potentialities which are established in non-existence in the Presence of Knowledge, because the Divine Names are realized in the mirrorings of the aptitudes of the potentialities. Thus, that which is me and my aptitude in its receptivity can understand the Divine Names and knows that these Names cannot be manifested except through our potentialities, just as Divinity is realized by the worshipper. Consequently, revealing Itself to our receptive potentialities from all eternity with His *nafs-i-rahmâni* in the Unknowable and His Essential revelation, He manifests and vivifies the *haqq* with His Names, which is in effect with all its powers in our hearts and in our interior in our hearts at that time when He vivifies and brings into being through that Breath of *rahmân*. Praise be to Him who deposited into the human nature (*nâsût*) the Holy mystery of His brilliantly penetrating Divine Nature (*lâhût*) and then began in His creation walking in the image of eater and drinker!

And we were therein immanences and potentialities and eras.

This means that before the *haqq* brought us into being we were in His Ipseity His immanences from all eternity because we were the same as His immanence, because He was and we were not: 'God was and with Him there was nothing.' We were with our total human reality the potentialities of Divine 'things' of His own Ipseity. Equally, we were His potentialities which were established in the state of non-being, and the Being of the *haqq* was our place of manifestation and was the place of revelation to the potentialities, and we were manifest in the mirror in His Being. Also, we were aeons of time in the *haqq*, and since the manifest was made possible by our being the places of manifestation, we were in degrees and in being some prior to the others, and some of us later than the others, because for us, all that is subject to us and all that is necessary for our states necessitates the priority of what is subject and necessary in honour, in degree and in being, thus we were aeons in the *haqq* in our being prior or later as place of manifestation. In the same way, as the manifest and the hidden are the same as the *haqq* who includes and encompasses all the manifested immanences and the interior potentialities and the totality of aeons and eras, and as all of that is collected together and that He is the same as that which is collected together, our potentialities were collected together in Him and were the same as His potentiality, and consequently, under this

consideration, we were the same as the totality of the immanences and potentialities and times.

Or else, we were the same as the *ḥaqq* in all eternity since the totality of the immanences, potentialities and times were in the Being of the *ḥaqq*. As the immanences, potentialities and times became degrees for His manifestation and descent, as He became individuated in their images, equally we were individuated and manifested in the images of the immanences, the potentialities and times. Thus we were equally immanences, potentialities and times in the Being of the *ḥaqq*.

There is another aspect. This is that we were the established potentialities in the Unknowableness (*ghayb*) of the *ḥaqq* and in the Presence of Knowledge, and we were the constructed and existent immanences in the universe of spirits. As we descended to the unknowablenesses (*ghuyûb*) of the heavens and the earth and passed through the totality of the stations of the heavens and the spheres and the stations of the unknowablenesses of the earth such as the minerals, plants and animals, and reached finally this human image, we were a very long time in the aeons of the Unknowableness of the *ḥaqq*.

There is another possibility of reading and understanding this, and that is: when we were manifest in the total perfection of the human image in the being of potentiality, we were at certain times from the aspect of immanences, potentialities and times, annihilated in Him. That is to say, our immanences and our realities of knowledge and our interior potentialities, our times and eras, being spent in the Being of the *ḥaqq*, our qualities and essences and the totality of our times which are manifest existents and immanential individuations were annihilated in the Being of the *ḥaqq*. The *ḥaqq* with His Essential and nominal revelation was revealed in our hearts and we had no knowledge of our own beings. The verse which comes after this points at this aspect, and there is a notice in this, that we, with our immanential realities and established potentialities, before existence were included and solidified with unknowable times in the Being of the *ḥaqq*. In the same way, after being, we became unknowable for many lengths of time in the Being of the *ḥaqq* due to our unknowableness and annihilation. Thus, the potentialities of the complete and perfect ones are not forever continuous and present in the place of manifestation of the revelation of the Ipseity and in annihilation in the *ḥaqq* with their essences and qualities, but due to manifesting and manifestation, and to complete and perfect the human selves, they descend to human qualities.

However, it is not always that this is in us, yet we are like that at times.

That is to say, being annihilated in the *ḥaqq* with all our qualities and essences does not mean that our being the Reality is permanently dominant over our creaturality, yet this dominance happens at certain times: 'There happened to be times with God wherein nothing expands us except God. There are times wherein the *ḥaqq* immanences and (at other times) does not' (Zayn-ul-'Abidin, R.A.). This is at the time when Man's reality is dominant over his creaturality because this is contrary to the necessities of human reality, because Man is both creature and Reality. He is between the Sea of Possibilities and the Sea of Necessarily-so-ness. His regard to both sides is equal. Being between Reality and creaturality he is always in collectivity with collectivity and in absoluteness with absoluteness. He may not be always in annihilation in the place of manifestation of the Essential revelation and being Absolute *ḥaqq* with the Being of the *ḥaqq* so that the revelation which is at the place of manifestation of the Perfect and Complete Man becomes concentrated and solidifies with total concentration in its origin, and that there be no necessity for the cutting-off and decline in the human places of manifestation which are the reasons of manifesting and manifestation, and the necessities of witnessing and being witnessed.

Now let it be known like this, that the Perfect and Complete Man who is in every century is receptive to Reality and Lordship and the Divine Presence always through his essential servanthood and complete creaturality and his being the worshipper of Divinity and the establisher of Lordship. In the same way, through his viceregency and through the aspect of his being realized with the totality of the Divine Names, he is receptive to creaturality and the Presence of immanence with the meanings of Divinity and Lordship which are in him, otherwise he would not have been a Viceregent with help and with the effusion which reaches the universe by his means. Thus, the Perfect and Complete Man is expansive to the Reality and creaturality of which he is receptive on one side, and by uniting between Reality and creaturality he is receptive and takes the realities of the immanence which are the degrees of creaturality and the Divine collectivity which are of the Presence of Names. Thus the Man, through such an absoluteness wherein there is absolutely no monopoly of the individuation of Reality or the individuation of creaturality, takes and receives the proximity of the *ḥaqq*.

Consequently, under these aspects he is always the *ḥaqq* and always the creature, and he collects both the *ḥaqq* and the creature, and he is absolutely divorced from being individuated with anything from the *ḥaqq* or from the *khalq* as it is the High Lord which is manifest in him. Consequently, according to this taste, the above-mentioned verse has this meaning: by virtue of the fact that we have collected between the *ḥaqq* and the creature and particularization and non-particularization, Reality is not constant over us. That is to say, at certain times we are collected in absoluteness, and at certain times we are realized in the collectivity between absoluteness and relativity. Which are things that guide to what we have mentioned in the order of spiritual blowing with the image of human genus. That is to say, the arrangement of the body of Jesus when the trustworthy (*amîn*) Spirit represented in the image of the humankind blew Jesus into Mary, and that his human image was included in the spiritual blowing, these are of the things that guide to what we have mentioned. In that the *ḥaqq* has qualified His Self as the Compassionate Self, and it is without a doubt that all which is qualified by a quality is subject to that quality in everything where that quality necessitates its presence. In other words, it is necessary for each thing qualified that it also necessitates that it should also need the necessities and the subjects of that quality, because if a thing is necessary, surely all that is subject to it is also necessary, and that which is subject to that thing is related to it. And in fact you know what the *nafs* necessitates in that which is breathed upon (in that which is made to have a self). That is to say, in the *nafs* of mankind, breathing necessitates blowing, and at the level of non-breathing the interior torment and pain necessitates breathing, and the breath of mankind from the interior of the heart extends over all the stops which are the places where letters come from, which are the points of exteriorization of the letters, and due to each stop it is necessary that it be a particular letter. Consequently, breathing (*nafas*) necessitates the elevation and lowering of the letters and the images of the letters and words, and equally it necessitates the actor and the acted-upon-ness of the words. Thus, equally, the Divine Breath necessitates the blowing. In the same way, it necessitates the breathing for the *rahmân* to liberate from torment the potentialities of the possibilities which are non-manifested in their state of establishment in non-existence. In the same way is necessitated for the Breath of the *rahmân* at the level of its extension, to extend over the Divine and immanental degrees from the interior of the First *ta'ayyun*, and that

at each degree that it be by virtue of the degree either Divine letters or immanential letters, and that in the particularizations which are in all degrees it is necessary that they be letters by virtue of their being singularities, and words by virtue of their combination. Further, it is equally necessary that they be high and active and effective letters which are Divine Names and Qualities, and that they be low, acted-upon and effected-upon letters which are immanential particularizations and creatural qualities, and thus it necessitates equally the Divine and immanential words. Thus, the Breath of *rahmân* is the uniqueness of the collectivity of the actions of the Names and immanential receptivities, and unites between the Divine Names with them and unites between act and being acted upon. It also contains spirituality and corporeality because the Breath of the *rahmân* effuses being by virtue of degrees and is particularized in all images. It is thus that it is said that the Divine Breath is the image of the universe. It is to it like the jewel of the *hayûlâ* (*al-jawhar al-hayûlânî*). How could it then be other than the same as Nature? That is to say, as has been mentioned, the Breath of *rahmân* necessitates in itself the images of the letters and the plurality of the Divine and immanential words. It is because of this necessariness that the Divine Breath is receptive of the image of the universe which is the existence of the immanence, and that the images of the universe became particularized in the Divine Breath. Thus, the Divine Breath is as jewel of the *hayûlâ* for the image of the universe, for the different images in the universe. Yet what the Divine Breath necessitates from the images of the universe is exactly the same as Nature. It is no other, because the images of the universe are manifested in Nature and the images of Nature are brought about through the action of Nature. The sensory and existential images which are not qualified by Nature, which are above Nature, are bestowed by Nature where they have no being outside. Consequently, the images that are necessitated and contained in the Divine Breath, whether they be images of the active Divine Names or whether they be images of acted-upon immanential images, they are manifested and immanenced in Nature and Nature is receptive of those images, because for the effective Names Nature is like a female for the male by which the order of immanencing becomes manifest in Nature. The Shaykh (R.A.) in section 11 of his chapter 198 of the *Futûhât al-Makkiyyah* speaks of this. Thus, the Divine and immanential images which the Breath of the *rahmân* necessitates being manifested and immanenced in Nature, Nature becomes acted-upon. However,

under the consideration that Nature becomes their actor as they manifest with the images of the Names of Nature in the materia of the 'Blindness' ('ama), then Nature becomes the active Divine Reality, and the Breath of the *rahmân*, receiving all the active images of the Names and those of the immanential acted-upon images, becomes for them a jewel of the *hayûlâ*. Consequently, Nature is the same as the Breath of the *rahmân* which is extended from the uniqueness of the reality of the collectivity of creatural acted-upon-ness and the reality of the Divine action from the Reality of the great Reality. The Breath of *rahmân* is interior and Nature is exterior. Thus, that God qualifies His Self (the *nafs-ar-rahmân*) by Breath (*nafas-ar-rahmân*) is His qualifying it with all the necessities of breath, like blowing and breathing, like His manifesting in the images of Divine and immanential letters and words which are the images which are manifested in Nature. And from the collection of all these is the image of the elements for where, for the purpose of blowing of the Spirit, the trustworthy Spirit was represented in that image and appeared to Mary and blew Jesus in that image.

And the elements are images from the images of Nature, and that which is above (both) the elements and of that which is born of them are equally images of Nature. That is to say, from the middle of the earth until one reaches the first heavens, earth, water, air and fire and all images that are born inside these, whether they be corporeal or spiritual, all images of kinds which are the totality of all these images, is an image from among the images of Nature which the Breath of the *rahmân* necessitates and effuses over Nature. Equally, that which is above the elements and that which is above the things born of the elements are equally in the same way images of Nature, which means that the spiritual images which are above the images of the seven heavens which are born from the elements are equally of the images of Nature. And they are the high spirits who are above the seven heavens, which means again, the high spirits which are above the images of the seven heavens, which are above the seven heavens, which are born from the elements but which are above the elements, they are equally like the elements an image of the images of Nature because they are what the Breath of the *rahmân* effused over Nature as images of Nature, and these are like the high spirits, like the Throne or the Chair, and like the incorporeal essences and intellects which are above them, but the spirits of the heavens and their essences are elemental because they are of the smoke of the elements and are born from it. But the spirits of the seven heavens and their

essences or their potentialities, they are also of the elements because they are in fact of the smoke of the elements and are born from the elements. **The angels immanenced in all the heavens are of that and they are elemental, and in each heaven that which is immanenced as an angel is of that heaven and is of the genus of that nature.** Consequently, all the angels that are immanenced in all the seven heavens are elementals because the heavens are elemental. Equally, in other words, the angels which are immanenced from all the seven heavens are elemental of a kind because the heavens are elemental, consequently they are also elemental, and the angels which are immanenced in each heaven are of the nature and kind of that heaven and are immanenced from it and are its inhabitants. The Shaykh (R.A.) is of the way that the seven heavens are elemental and the angels that are immanenced from each heaven are equally elemental, and *fanâ'* reaches the angels of the heavens. That which is above the elements and the heavens are images of Nature like the Throne and the Chair, and the angels immanenced from their nature and kind are not reached by *fanâ'* and fire and blameworthiness. The way of the Sufis and of the people of law and the wise ones of Islam and the old people of *isnrâq*, a great many people, are equally according to this belief. **And those above them are of Nature, and because of this God qualified them with disputation, because the angels of the high, they are of the nature of complementary opposition.** Those who are above the elementals, who are of Nature, whom the fire and blameworthiness does not aspect, are the higher spirits who are above the seven heavens. But because they are of Nature God qualified these angels of the high (*malâ' al-a'lâ*) with disputing. in His words: 'There was not of that knowledge with the high angels and they disputed', because Nature is of complementary opposites, like heat and cold. The dispute among the high angels results from the complementary opposition which is in Nature. That is why they were qualified with disputing. Complementary opposition is necessitated in Nature by its four realities, because the ipseity of Nature is an intellectual ipseity. Heat, cold, dryness and dampness collected together are its four realities because Nature is the manifestation of the degree of Divinity where the collectivity of Life and Knowledge and Will and Power are the principles of Divinity. Life is supervisor (*nâzir*) to heat, Knowledge to cold, and Will to dryness, and Power supervises humidity. Even though humidity emanates from cold, and dryness from heat, yet heat is not the same as dryness and dryness the same as heat. Thus the

Breath of Nature, from the aspect of reality, is the collectivity of complementary opposition, and because of the order of becoming, some of the realities of Nature are manifest and predominant over others. Under this consideration, complementary opposition happens in the essence of Nature itself. As Nature is the manifestation of Divinity, complementary opposition exists equally from its four qualities which are the principles of Divinity. In that way, the totality of the Divine Names of complementary opposition which the Breath of the *rahmân* necessitates, like the words, the Merciful, the Avenger, the Elevator and the Abaser, are individuated and manifested in Nature. Thus the complementary opposition manifests in Nature from the Names of complementary opposition (*mutaqâbilât—asmâ' mutaqâbila*).

And those complementary oppositions which are in the Divine Names are relationships which were bestowed by the Breath of the *rahmân*. These complementary oppositions are relationships of non-existence ('*adam*') which exist among the Divine Names. These are bestowed by the Breath of the *rahmân*, because in accordance with the consideration that the Names are relationships of non-existence and knowledgeable meanings, they have no complementary opposition in them, because heat and cold, black and white, are collected together in the intellect and in thought. They are not complementary oppositions. The complementary opposition among the Names manifests with the images of the Names, by which imagery the Breath of *rahmân* causes it to be realized, the realities of the relationships of the Names. In other words, when the Breath of the *rahmân* expands over the non-existent potentialities which are in the Presence of possibilities, then by virtue of each potentiality in each degree it becomes particularized and varied. Thus, when the Breath of the *rahmân* bestows existence to the relationships of the non-existent Names, the complementary opposition which manifests among the images of the Names takes place from the side of the Breath of the *rahmân*, because manifesting is from the side of the Breath of the *rahmân*. Yet, however, there is no complementary opposition particularized among actions and receptions in the Breath of *rahmân*. As the Breath of the *rahmân* is like the *materia prima* (*hayûlâ*) for the actions and receptions, all actions and receptions in it are one and the same qualification. The complementary oppositions become manifest by virtue of the particularization and manifestation of the Breath of the *rahmân* in the mirrors of the potentialities which are non-existent relationships. Yet the complementary opposition that the Breath of the

rahmân bestows is at the level of the particularization of the Divine Names with the Breath of the *rahmân*: in the Presence of Divinity. Do you not see how the Ipseity who is outside this determination became Rich beyond Need of the universes in this matter? As for the world, (how) it came out in the image of the one that brought it into being, and yet it is no other than the Divine Breath. Now, let it be known like this, that there are degrees for the Breath of the *rahmân* which were already mentioned at the beginning of this book. One of the degrees is this, that the Breath of the *rahmân* is the concentration and condensation of the Breath of *rahmân* in the heart of the Unknowableness of the First *ta'ayyun*, and this is the degree of the uniqueness and absolute transcendence and *la ta'ayyun* of the Breath of the *rahmân*. Another degree is its extension and propulsion (*inbi'âth*) from the interior of the *la ta'ayyun*. This is the degree of its particularization with one degree from among the degrees of the Divine Unknowableness without particularization and with a degree of the First Particularization. A third degree is its collectivity between *la ta'ayyun* and the *ta'ayyun* of its quiddity (*huwiyyah*) and isthmuseity in the First *ta'ayyun*, because the Breath of the *rahmân* is the same as the *ta'ayyun* and non-*ta'ayyun*, and is the same as the manifest and the interior, because that which is particularized by the First *ta'ayyun* is the potential of the interior, and at the same time, equally, the particularization is manifest. This is like the letter *alif* and the *hamza*. Yet another degree is its extension from the *ta'ayyun awwal* and its degree of particularization through other degrees of the letters of the Unknowable. Thus, when the Breath of the *rahmân* extends from the interior of the First *ta'ayyun* it becomes the specific praise of Oneness in the state of the uniqueness of the Divine letters and words. As the Breath of the *rahmân* extends over the Divine and immanential degrees, Divine and immanential letters and words, becoming particularized with it and in it, become manifest. Thus, in the first degree the Breath of the *rahmân* is the same as the Ipseity of Uniqueness, because it is concentrated and condensed in It. It is non-particularized either intelligibly or by being. Thus, in that degree the Ipseity of Uniqueness cannot be qualified with being Rich beyond Need of the Breath of the *rahmân*, because a thing cannot be qualified by not being in need of something which is in its own self. In the other degrees however, the Ipseity of Uniqueness is Rich beyond Need of the Breath of *rahmân* because it comprises the plurality of the Names and creaturalities. Thus the Shaykh (R.A.) says: Do you not see the

Uniqueness of the Ipseity which is outside this determination of the Breath of the *rahmân*, concerning whom (that is, the Ipseity of Uniqueness) there came to be Richness beyond Need of the universes? However, being Rich beyond Need of the universes is being Rich beyond Need of the Breath of the *rahmân*, because the Breath of the *rahmân* is the origin of the universes. Thus it is because of this that the potentialities of the universe came out in the image of the one who brought them into existence. Yet the one who brought into existence the universe is no other than the Breath of the *rahmân*. Thus the universe, in accordance with the image of the Divine Breath, is manifested in concordance with the collectivity of actions and receptions, which means the universe came out in the image of the one who brought it into existence. Yet the universe is no other than the Divine Breath. What there is of heat is the higher of the Divine Breath. When it manifested with the actions and receptions collected in it with opposing modalities, that which was of heat in the Divine Breath, with the Divine Breath the images of the Lordly Names became heightened in the actions and became particularized in the high aspects. And what there was of coldness and humidity in it became low, which means that in the same way that which results in the Divine Breath of cold and humidity, the Divine Breath becomes low in the immanential images which are parts of the universe, and manifests that way. And what there is of dryness, that becomes established and does not go down. The sediments are for the cold and the damp. Do you not see the doctor, that if he wants to prescribe the drinking of a medicine for a person he looks at the water of the urine in the glass, and if he sees sedimentation he knows that the maturity is completed and makes him drink a medicine which will accelerate the maturity. As for sedimentation, it appertains to the humidity and coldness of the nature. Which means that that which happens in the Breath of the *rahmân* from dryness is that by which the Breath of the *rahmân* is established, and that does not descend. Thus, sedimentation, descending to the bottom, is special to coldness and dampness. And do you not see the doctor who in fact when he wants to give a potion to drink to a patient he looks into the glass of his water. If he sees that the water is sedimented he knows that in fact the maturity is complete, and for the doctor maturity is the aptitude and preparation of the matter for the expulsion, and expulsion is brought about through inundation which is through humidity, or bringing down and debasing through cold. Thus the doctor makes that sick person drink that

medicine so that the medicine will accelerate the expulsion and maturity in him, that is to say, to accelerate the sick into conquest of health so that the sick becomes cured quickly. If the nature of the sick man is cold and damp, the sediment of the water of his urine is from the coldness and dampness of his nature, because with dampness happens inundation, and with cold results descent. Thus it eliminates and expels from the nature of the sick what there is over and above the natural level of dampness and cold, and establishes that which is necessary in him through dryness. Thus, sedimentation is for the coldness of possibilities, because the Divine Breath at the degree of Divinity having propelled with the effusion of becoming from the interior of the Light of being from the First *ta'ayyun*, where the First *ta'ayyun* is in a state of containing the collectivity of things and the collectivity of the realities of action and being acted upon which are in the bringing-about of the Presence of possibilities, thus the coldness of the places of manifestation of receptivities which are in the essence of the Self relativizes and concentrates and coagulates it, because the actor and the receiver both exist in the very Self. Consequently, the actor manifests with the quality of heat, and the receptor with the quality of cold. Thus, in this steam of light and meanings the images of the Unknowable become coagulated. Thus, that which could emerge in the Unknowable becomes manifest. After that, the emergeabilities in the Breath become extended according to three steams, one of which is high, the other low, and the third medium, collective, one and isthmuseital, and all the realities of action and being acted upon become particularized in the essence of the Breath. Thus, the images of two unknowables, that is to say, the unknowableness of the Lord and the unknowableness of the worshipper, become manifest. Thus, in the heightened Breath all the Divine realities of effectiveness and light of action become particularized with the images of the Divine Light and the particularities of the Necessarily-so-ness of the *haqq*. Thus the Shaykh (R.A.), in his word concerning the heat and the highness of the heat, points at the Divine realities of effectiveness of the light of action, and in the Breath that extends to the low that they express according to the realities of the places of manifestation of being acted upon, whereby the totalities of the realities of the effected-upon-ness of being acted upon become particularized with the immanental images and particularizations of the possibilities of being. Thus the emergence of the immanence and the creatural universe emerged. And the Shaykh, in consideration of his isthmuseity between the

two oceans, collects in himself the realities of active effects and the immanential realities of acted-upon effects. That which is individuated in this degree is the Perfect and Complete Man. Thus, when the Divine Breath becomes manifest in Nature, which is the manifested degree of Divinity, by necessitating the realities of the Divine Names and the places of manifestation of the realities of creaturiality and other qualities of complementary oppositions—because in this degree the Divine Breath is interior and Nature is exterior—then there is marriage between Nature and the Divine Breath, and these two are like one thing, because the images of the Divine Names and the creaturial qualities which are complementary oppositions and which are necessitated in the Breath of the *rahmân*, become manifest in Nature, and equally Nature manifests those images in a very particular aspect in the Divine Breath. After this in fact that human person is the dough of God the High which He kneaded with His two Hands, and they are two complementary opposites, and if you say the two Hands are both right Hands, they are still not devoid of any distinction between the two of them, which means that the Shaykh (R.A.), having mentioned that Nature is complementary opposition and that the complementary oppositions which are among the Divine Names are from the Breath of the *rahmân*, goes on to mention that the Perfect and Complete Man who is individuated in the isthmuseity between the actions of the Names and the receptivities of the places of manifestation which are of the necessities of the Breath of *rahmân*, this Perfect Man is created by two complementary opposite Hands, and that complementary opposition which is included in the Breath of the *rahmân* manifests in his creation. That is to say, after the realization of the complementary opposition which is between the Names and the complementary opposition which is in Nature, God the High in fact kneaded the dough of this human person with two Hands: 'Indeed God created Adam in His own image and according to the image of the universe.' That is to say, God the High made the dough of Adam with the image of the Divine Names of action which is His right Hand, and the image of the possibilities of the places of manifestation of acted-upon-ness which is His left Hand, and God's two Hands are complementary opposites. In consideration of the fact that it is both Divine and immanential and nominal and of the places of manifestation and of action and of acted-upon-ness, and in consideration of the fact of it being of all the images of the *haqq* and of the image of the universe, they are two complementary opposites. The Shaykh (R.A.) said in the

Wisdom of Adam that God created Adam with both His Hands and that he is no other than the same as the collectivity between the two images, the image of the universe and the image of the *ḥaqq*, and both of them are the Hands of the *ḥaqq*, and even if God's both Hands were two right Hands there is nothing lacking in that thing of differentiation between the two Hands, that is to say, even if God's both Hands are right Hands, and that it is clear that His right Hand is manifest because right is Ability and the images of the Divine Names of action and effect, and that He has Power and Ability in bringing about and manifesting, and that also His left Hand is a right Hand because the Divine Names of action and effect do not become particularized due to the proceeding in complementary opposition to them by the immanential potentialities of being acted upon and being made effective. That is to say, because with the words 'My two Hands' the two Hands thus qualified are with which He proceeded to bringing him about, that proceeding is suitable (proper) to the Divine Person, and that proceeding is to turn to bringing him about with the complementary opposite Names, or it is to turn to bringing him about with the images of the collectivity of the images of both actions and receptivities which are carried in the Divine Breath. And God the High proceeded to bring about Adam with both His Hands due to His act of favour and grace which came about for this kind of mankind, which again means that this kind of mankind which He created with both His Hands He has elevated over other creatures which He has created with one Hand, and He aggrandized him and showed him generosity. Thus, to the one who refused prostration to Adam who is created by both His Hands, He said: 'What prevented you from prostrating yourself to that person whom I have created with both My Hands, and to prostrate to whom I had ordered you? Did you feel too proud over that person who is the same as you, that is to say, elemental like you, or did you become one of those angels who are higher than the elements, who were not ordered to prostrate to Adam, and yet you are not of those high ones? Perhaps rather you are like him, an elemental. There is no state in you whereby you would be proud, since you are, like him, an elemental.' Thus, because of favour and grace for Adam, God the Great aggrandized and showed him generosity with the words: '. . . whom I have created with both My Hands', and admonished Iblis who refused to prostrate himself to him. What is meant by the higher ones are those who are higher by their essence rather than because of their being of luminous

emergence elementally, yet they are of Nature. These are the *malâ'ika al-âlîn* which are lost in adoration and prostration in the Beauty (*jamâl*) of the Ipseity. In their luminosity the determinations of necessarily-ness are dominant over the determinations of possibilities. As their aspects of creaturality are in *fanâ'* in the *ḥaqq* they know nothing else but the *ḥaqq*. They do not know that Adam was created, and they do not know that the angels have been ordered to prostrate to him. And if He made Man superior to other things of the kinds of elements, it is only because of his being immanenced from mud, and he is superior in kind to all that He has created from the elements without proceeding. Thus Man did not become superior in kind to others of the kinds of elements except because he was a human being made of mud, which means because God proceeded to create him from mud and to bring him into being by both His Hands. Thus Man is the highest kind of all those created from the elements without this procedure. In short, he is superior to all elementals in the universe to whom He did not proceed in the same way, because He has proceeded to their creation with the Name 'One', whereas the creation of Man with two Hands happens through the collectivity of complementary oppositions and complementary representations, where there is not a single quality from the Divine Names and Qualities, nor of the places of immanential manifestation and of the receptivity of possibilities, that is not realized in his totality of place of manifestation. And Man in rank is higher than the worldly and heavenly angels, and the high angels are better than this kind of Man by the conclusive Divine attestation. Thus, Man is higher than the earthly angels and the heavenly angels in degree because he is created by the procedure of the two Hands, whereas the creation of the angels of the earth and heavens is proceeded to with one Hand. And the higher angels are better than this kind of Man by Divine verdict, that is to say, than this animal man, because the reality of this kind is annihilated in his creaturality, and his luminosity is annihilated in darkness, and these are manifested with their own selves. The Divine verdict is the words: 'Or are you of the higher ones?' The creaturality of these is annihilated in the Reality. Thus, because of their creaturality and darkness being annihilated in Reality and luminosity, and because of the predominance of Reality in their nature, the high angels are better than this kind of Man which is the opposite of what they are, but, in comparison to the degree of the Complete Man, which is according to the image of the *ḥaqq*, as mankind falls from the degree

of completion in consideration of the predominance of creaturality in the humankind, the high angels, who are lost in adoration in prostration in the face of the *ḥaqq*, equally fall from the degree of Divine human completion because they are the places of manifestation of Awe and Majesty (*jalâl*) inside the Beauty (*jamâl*), and not the place of manifestation of the image of the Divine collectivity of the Names. Thus, the most honourable and the most gracious place of manifestation is the Complete Man, who is the place of manifestation of the image of the Divine collectivity of Essential Names wherein creaturality and Reality do not predominate one over the other. His manifestation on both these aspects is the same. His manifestation as one side is not superior to his manifestation with the other side. Manifesting and manifestation, for witnessing and being a witness, the determinations of both sides are present with him, and he is perpetual between the two sides with the grand isthmuseity and he collects in himself the two sides. Perhaps rather, in the human qualities and in elemental forms in which mankind is, their creaturality being annihilated in the Reality like in the angels lost in adoration, they equally are better, because the angels have no human qualities in them, whereas these, the mankind, when they annihilate the human qualities in the Reality they become apt to be the place of manifestation to the totality of the Divine Qualities, whereas the angels lost in adoration have no receptivity to Names other than which are particular to them in the valley without cultivation. Thus, the high angels, being lost in adoration in the lights of the Beauty of the Ipseity of the *ḥaqq*, and as their emergence is luminous and natural, are better than the elemental emergence of Man, but one person from among the humankind becomes like the angels lost in adoration and becomes annihilated and lost in adoration and the praise and grace of the Beauty of the *ḥaqq*, and after that becomes the place of manifestation of the collectivity of the images of the Divine Names, and that image and that collectivity is not manifested in the angels lost in adoration, thus that person becomes higher: 'Indeed We created Man in the best of modes.'

The Shaykh (R.A.) in section 198 of the 11th chapter of the *Futûḥât* tells us about the superior honourability of the high angels over Adam, and tells that he was guided to this by a dream that the Envoy saw, and had not known that before this dream. In these words he mentions the superiority of honour of the angels lost in adoration over Adam, in the same way as has been mentioned, in that their creaturality is

annihilated in the Reality and that their selves have found *fanâ*' in the face of the Reality of the *ḥaqq*, and that the elemental and natural darkness and the qualities of humanity and of creaturality manifesting in Man, because it sometimes happens in Man that the determinations of the qualities of humanity predominate over the Divine Qualities in him and he becomes veiled from the *ḥaqq*, whereas in the angels lost in adoration the creatural qualities are destroyed and they do not become veiled, it is under these considerations that they are more honourable, but they are not absolutely honourable. The Complete Man, who is no other than the place of manifestation of all and the image of the collectivity of arrival, by virtue of being the grand isthmuseity, and his being able to return from the degree of completeness to the station of more completeness and to descend to the station of complete servanthood, and because he becomes annihilated in the Ipseity of the *ḥaqq*, and: 'Indeed We have graced and honoured the sons of Adam', he is more graced and honoured and superior to all. The bringing about of the creation and the aspecting of the Divine Love of the Ipseity to His creation: 'I was a hidden treasure and I loved to be known, and I created the creation so that they know', the cognosis of the Divine Ipseity and the ultimate cause and purpose of the universe results from the creation through Man. And other creations of high and low are created in consequence as an inseparable accompaniment. Consequently, as the Divine Love of the Ipseity faces by origin the creation of Adam, the collectivity of the Divine cognosis and worship of the Ipseity happens through him, just as total Divine polishing and reflection happens by him. That is why Man is most graced and honoured. Especially where it concerns the faults and errors of Adam at the level of the existence of complete absolution (*tawbah*) it comprises completion and causes the revelation of the *ḥaqq* with the multiplicity of Names. He who wills to know the Divine Self, let him know the universe, because it is that he who knows his self indeed knows his Lord which has manifested in him, just as the universe manifested in the Breath of the *rahmân*, by which Breath God the High liberated the Divine Names whose effects were not manifested, by manifesting their effects. This means that that person who wishes to know God's Self, let that person know the universe, because when a person knows his own self, indeed he knows his Lord in which the universe is manifested. That is to say that the universe is manifested in that Breath of the *rahmân* by which God the High exhilarated from among the Divine Names that torment

which witnessed, because of the manifestation of the effects of the Divine Names from the non-manifestation of those effects. In other words, that person who wants to know the Breath of the *rahmân*, let him know the universe which is manifested in the Breath of the *rahmân*, and that his own *nafs* is from the universe, and he who knows his own self knows his Lord. That is to say, let him know the universe which is manifested in the Breath of the *rahmân*, which the *ḥaqq* the High, due to that self's expulsion and continuation from the interior of the First *ta'ayyun*, exhilarated and expanded it by the Divine Names when those Names were established in the state of non-existence, and from the constriction and pain and torment which the witnessing of the non-manifestation of the effects of the Names had engendered, and which exhilaration resulted due to the manifestation of the effects of the Names through the Breath of the *rahmân*. Thus, that which is manifest in the Breath of the *rahmân* from the images of the universe is the images of the Divine Names which are manifested in the Breath of the *rahmân* by the Breath of the *rahmân*, and it is the effects of the Names that the Breath of the *rahmân* manifested by exhilarating and expanding the torment and the constriction from the Names. Thus, the universe is the images of the Divine Names which are manifested in the Breath of the *rahmân*, and because of the individuation of the Breath of the *rahmân* therein, it is the same as it. He made an obligation to His Self for what He brought into being in Himself, and the first effect which came about for the breathing out was in certain of these areas of the Presence, and after that the order was not obliterated as it came down with the expanding of everything until it reaches the last of what He brought into being. Thus, God the High made an obligation upon His Self by bringing into existence the images of His Names in Himself with His own Breath of *rahmân*, because His Names are the same as Himself and His Ipseity. Thus, bringing into manifestation the effects of His Names is an obligation upon His Names. God's bringing about the images of the universe, which are the images of the Names, through the expansion of the Breath of the *rahmân*, through Himself which is the Breath of the *rahmân*, is in His own Self, and the obligation is also from Himself upon Himself, because there is nothing outside His Being. Thus, the first effect which happened for the Breath of the *rahmân* happened in that Divine Person in some of the Presences of Divinity by bringing into existence some of the images of the Names, manifesting the effects of the Names which were in potential in Him. After this the

order was not obliterated as it descended with the exhilaration of everything in general until it reached the last existent. However, there is no last for the manifestation of the Names with their effects, and there is not, equally, a last for the manifestation of the effects with the Names.

**And everything is in the Breath itself
As light is in the dark before dawn itself.**

The universes and the immanences and the *a'yân* and the effects which are the totality of the realities of necessarily-so-ness and the images of the Names are manifested and individuated in the Breath itself, just as the light itself is manifested and particularized in its opposite, that is to say, like in the darkness of the end of the night. In other words, just as light is manifested at the end of the night, which emerges from the end of the night, the totality of the images and the effects of the Names, and the realities of the possibilities and their images, are manifested in the Breath of the *rahmân*.

**And knowledge by proof
Is like the dawn for one who is sleepy,
And will see what I have said to him
As a dream which leads to the Breath**

The cognition of the Breath of the *rahmân* with the proofs of intellect and deductive intelligence is particular to that man who is asleep at dawn. Since he is occupied with deduction the light of *kashf* is removed from him and he is in the sleep of ignorance, and veiled. Thus, what I have said concerning the Breath of the *rahmân* is to him like a dream which points at the Breath of the *rahmân*, that is to say, what I have told him is like a dream for him that he has seen in his sleep of ignorance and which he interprets from behind the veil as the Breath, and he is not in that interpretation according to *kashf* and individuation. For instance, the sleeper interprets the dream he has seen from behind the veil sometimes correctly and sometimes incorrectly. Thus, what we have said to the people of intellectual proof of the Breath of the *rahmân* is like a dream which he interprets as the Breath, but he does not know what we have told him according to *kashf* or particularization so that he interprets our words concerning the Breath of the *rahmân* and understands it and interprets it according to particularization. Consequently, our words which concern the Breath of the *rahmân*, for the

owner of theoretical proof is like a dream at the end of the day, for the reality of which he has no particularization or *kashf*, and how could the knowledge of the Breath of *rahmân* come to him by way of deduction? Thus, the knowledge of the Breath of *rahmân* according to *kashf* and reality happens at the level of the manifestation of the dawn of the Divine revelation and the rising of the sun of the Reality of Mohammed. That is to say, it is only knowable through *kashf* and the clarity and *dhawq* and consciousness, and cannot be known by proof.

And it will relieve him of all distress
As in the reading of the chapter 'And He Frowned.'

Thus it would relieve the man of knowledge through intellectual proof from all distress and torment, just as in the reading of the chapter on 'And He Frowned', where he would come to the sentence: 'Or remember that My rememoration is beneficial to him', and arose to its order. In other words, in his state of being veiled and ignorant, when he reads the chapter on 'And He Frowned' and reaches the sentence: 'Or remember that My rememoration is beneficial to him', and knows that he is in accordance with that order, and he reflects on it, and after reflecting on it he meditates on it, his sadness and torment in his conscience and in the darkness of his veiling would be relieved from him by rememoration. In the chapter 'And He Frowned' the mystery of the words that come later on: 'Today the faces are smiling and in happiness and laughing and joyful' becomes revealed to him, and just as in the sentence, at the level of rememoration his veiling would be removed and he would be freed from the frown and torment, and his face would be happy and joyful. Another way of understanding is: if he were reading the chapter 'And He Frowned', when he was at the level of veil and unawareness and he was in torment and frowning through being knowledgeable by intellectual proof, his state would change into the state of the words: 'Today the faces are smiling and in happiness and laughing and joyful', and reading this verset with the tongue of his state at the level of being happy and joyful he would be relieved from his state of frowning. In this case it would be as if the poem read: He would be relieved by the quote: 'Or remember that My rememoration is beneficial to him' in the reading of the chapter 'And He Frowned.'

And indeed revealed to that one
Who came in request of live fire

In fact the High God revealed Himself to that person who was not demanding knowledge. That is to say, when Moses, son of 'Imran, came requesting fire, the High God revealed Himself to him in the bush in the image of fire, which is what he requested, and openly addressed him: 'Indeed I am God', and the mystery of this hidden reality was revealed, that the images of the Names are the same as the images of the universe which are manifested with the Breath of *rahmân*, and that the Breath of *rahmân* encompasses all the images of the universe and is present and manifest in all of them.

**And he saw it as fire but it was light
For the kings and for the night patrols.**

Thus Mōses (S.A.) saw the *ḥaqq* which was revealed in the image of fire, as fire, and before he was called to, he knew it as fire, whereas that which he saw was light which is manifest in the high kings and low night patrols. In other words, when the Light of the face of the *ḥaqq* was exemplified as fire in the image of the bush, Moses (S.A.) thought it was fire, whereas that which he saw was light. Thus Moses (S.A.) did not interpret his dream and did not pass into the reality of the thing he saw in the image of the thing which he naturally requested. Had he passed over (to the other meaning) he would have known that what he saw was that Light of the *ḥaqq* which is manifest and revealed in the kings who are of completion and perfection and of the origin, and in the happy ones, and in the lower ones who do actions of righteousness and justice and duly perform their religious acts. Or, it means His Light is revealed in the complete and perfect kings who are the people of insight (*kashf*) and revelation, and in the people of the night patrol who are experts of theory who are people who determine with intellectual proof in the night of the darkness of nature, because the manifestation of the light of revelation in the high, honourable, elevated ones, is like its manifestation in the low and the abject, because superiority in degrees is only manifest by virtue of receptivity in the complete or the lacking. 'Do you not see superiority of some in what the *rahmân* created?'

**If you have understood what I have spoken of,
Know then that you are wretched.**

That is to say, if you have understood what I have been talking to you about, that God the High, being manifest and revealed in the higher

receptivities and lower places of manifestation with His Breath of *rahmân* and the Light of being, became revealed and manifest in the image of the fire which was the requirement of Moses, and if you have understood what I have said here of this, and if you have recognized and understood the height and worth of these words and from what Presence of the Divine high Presences it has come down, then in fact you are poor and needy and the knowledge which has resulted in you from proof is a captive and subject thing. Or, that which manifests in the higher individuations and in the lower persons is the Divine Light and the Breath of the *rahmân*, but you can only witness fire through individuation and you are veiled from the Light that individuates, and if you have understood these words, then you will know that you are needy, wretched, perplexed and a spendthrift and you possess nothing, because you are not present with your being. Your being is one of the images from among the images which are individuated and manifested in the Breath of *rahmân* by the Breath of *rahmân*, and that thing which you request other than the *haqq* is just like your being existent through conjectural existence, like the existence of a mirage, as a mirage is a plot of land different from the land which surrounds it because you are thirsty for water, until it becomes a thing that does not exist, that God exists in its place.

**Had he requested something other than that,
He would have seen Him in that, and would not have
changed it back (its meaning).**

Had Moses (S.A.) requested something other than fire, of course God would have revealed Himself to him in that specific request and he would have seen the *haqq* in that. The High *haqq* would not have changed His aspect from revealing Himself as that thing. Of course He would have revealed Himself in what he requested. Or else, Moses would not have changed his face from the *haqq* because He would have been revealed in what he requested. That is to say, when the strength and determination of Moses (S.A.) had reached its extreme point in his request, of course the High God would have revealed Himself in his material request, and if He had revealed Himself in something other than the fire which he requested, Moses might have deviated from it. Thus, if Moses (S.A.) had requested something other than fire, God the High would have revealed Himself in that thing, and he would have witnessed the *haqq* in that thing and would not have deviated from it,

just as he would have deviated from that thing in which God would have revealed Himself other than the thing that he requested, because in this He revealed Himself in what Moses requested, and Moses had no vision for anything other than what he requested, and you also, like Moses, at the beginning of the order, if you were veiled from the Light of the *ḥaqq* and were to request the fire of individuation, then witness the *ḥaqq* in His revelation in that specific thing which you have requested and hear His call so that you are not veiled from the *ḥaqq* with the complete veiling.

And this Word of Jesus, when God became present to him in the station of 'Until We are made to know, and We know' (this refers to two different uses of the word, one starting with the letter *nūn* and the other starting with the letter *ya*, which comes in the Quranic text), and questioned him, whether that which they attributed to him, that he is the *ḥaqq*, was related to him, even though He already had knowledge from the beginning by what that order was at the beginning. When it became present for God the High in the station of '*na'lam ya'lam*', He addressed the Word of Jesus when He already knew in the station of *ya'lam* which is the word realized in its meaning, and questioned that Word Jesus, whether that thing which was attributed to him, that is, the Divinity which was attributed to him, whether this was true, that is to say: 'Is the order of Divinity related to you established in the order itself and acceptance of it emanate from you, or not?', even though before questioning him the knowledge of the *ḥaqq* in this matter was established, and that the *ḥaqq* did know whether this order was, that is to say, did it emanate from Jesus or not. And He said to him: 'Did you say to people: "Take me and my mother as two gods other than God"?' Thus, when God the High said to Jesus: 'Did you tell the people to "take me and my mother Mary as two gods other than God"?', God then established His own *nafs* in the station of 'Until it is known to Us' (*an ḥatta na'lam*), that is to say that We are made to know that these words emanated from you, even though He knew what had emanated from him. It is without a doubt in good form (*adab*), the answer from the one questioned, when He revealed Himself to him in this station and in this image which necessitated the wisdom of the answer in the separation in the very essence of oneness of totality. It is necessary for Jesus to comply with good form for the question posed to him by the *ḥaqq*, as the question came according to the image of the station of separation, because if God revealed Himself to Jesus in this station,

which is the station of separation, in the image of this question, even though when He knew the answer, as He addressed Jesus with the word 'you' which singularizes Jesus in the way of the question which arises from the very essence of oneness of totality, even though the address was of that that he knew, equally the wisdom of Jesus necessitated the answer to this question, which by virtue of the revelation which happened to Jesus, he should answer in the very essence of totality of oneness with separation. That is to say, Jesus knew very well that the *ḥaqq* knew, and he answered in the image of separation in the essence of the totality of oneness, and said, starting with the transcendence: 'Praise to You', and limiting it with the letter *kaf* (the letter *kaf* denoting the second person singular) which necessitates being face to face and address. Thus Jesus (S.A.) said: 'Praise to You', thus initiating with transcendence and thus limiting it to God with that letter *kaf* which necessitates facing the one spoken to and addressing him, and with the letter *kaf* he singularized the *ḥaqq*, just as the *ḥaqq* the High had with the words 'you said'; thereby singularizing Him he started it with singularization. 'It cannot happen for me due to the separation of my *nafs* from You that I say that which is not my right to say, that which neither my quiddity (*huwiyyah*) nor my essence necessitates', which means that by virtue of the fact that I have been singularized from You by my selfness and my individuation that it should come about for my self that I should say these words to which I have no right, which words my quiddity and my essence do not necessitate, because my essence requires my servanthood and necessitates need of You in my being, because I am, in my own *nafs*, non-existent, and am existent with Your existence. What is manifest and individuated in me is Your being. Thus, to claim Divinity which is particular to You and necessitated by Your Ipseity, is not necessitated by my quiddity and my essence which necessitates servanthood. 'Had I said it You would certainly have known it, because in fact You, You are the speaker, and he who speaks an order certainly has the knowledge of what he has said established in him, and You are the tongue by which I speak', just as God's Envoy (S.A.) informed us from his Lord in the Divine information, and said: 'I am his tongue by which he speaks', and brought His Quiddity to be the same as the speaking tongue and related the spoken words to the servant. In this answer Jesus means that in fact God must have known if he had said these things, because You are the speaker by virtue of Your manifestation and individuation in me, whereas I am established upon non-

existence, and if somebody speaks an order, surely he knows it, which means, if I said it You would know it because You are the one who spoke. Thus the words: ' . . . because in fact You, You are the speaker' is the tongue or the words of oneness of totality (*jam*'). It is the tongue and words of closeness of obligation by virtue of the annihilation of the being of the servant in the *ḥaqq*, and the manifestation of the *ḥaqq* in the image of the servant. Thus, when God speaks, the servant is His tongue and words. The words: ' . . . and You are the tongue by which I speak' is the tongue of separation, that is to say, yet You are that tongue of mine by which I speak, which in fact the Envoy of God (S.A.) informed us from his Lord in the Divine information, that is to say, in a *ḥadīth qudsī*. Thus God the High said: 'I am his tongue by which he speaks', which means, I am that tongue of My servant by which My servant speaks. Thus God made His own Quiddity to be the same as the speaking tongue. Equally, with the words: 'Did you say . . . ?' God related speech to the servant, that is to say, the servant speaks with My tongue even though I am his tongue. After that, the valid servant finished his answer with the words: 'You know what is in my *nafs*.' After that, the valid servant, that is to say, Jesus (S.A.), ended his answer with the words: 'You know what is in my *nafs*', which means, that which is in my self of Your Quiddity and Your complete perfection, You know, because my quiddity is no other than Your Quiddity. Yet, in this station of separation in the place of manifestation of Jesus, He who speaks these words with the tongue of Jesus is the *ḥaqq*, who with the word '*ta'lam*' addresses the station of oneness of totality (*jam*'), and the speaker knows what there is in his own *nafs*. 'And I do not know what there is in it.' By virtue of the fact that my self is Your Being, I do not know the things which are potentially in my *nafs*. And He banished knowledge from the quiddity of Jesus by virtue of the fact of his quiddity, not by virtue of the fact that he was the speaker and of effect. Thus the *ḥaqq*, which was speaking with the tongue of Jesus, removed knowledge from the quiddity of Jesus in consideration of particularization by virtue of the fact that He was his quiddity, and not by virtue of the fact that He removed it from Jesus who was speaker and of effect. Because by virtue of this the quiddity of Jesus is the Quiddity of the *ḥaqq*, and the one who speaks and is of effect is His Quiddity. In the Quran the last quote is given as: 'And I do not know what there is in Your Self', whereas the Shaykh (R.A.) quoted it as: 'And I do not know what there is in it', because the Shaykh wants to

awaken one's self to the awareness that Jesus' self was the same as the Self of the *ḥaqq*, because saying: 'And I do not know what there is in Your Self' erases knowledge for Jesus for that which is in the *nafs* of the *ḥaqq*, and the words: 'And I do not know what there is in it', by virtue of the fact that Jesus' self is the same as the Self of the *ḥaqq*, removes knowledge equally from the things which are in His Self. **'Indeed You, You are the Knower of the Unknown.'** By this he emphasizes the distinction, supports and confirms the declaration, ensuring it that no one knows the Unknowable except God. That is to say, Jesus (S.A.), in his words: 'Indeed You, You are the Knower of the Unknown' put in his words the extra 'You' for the distinction at the level of the *kuffiyyin* and for the support at the level of the *başariyyin* for confirming the declaration of separation in the essence of oneness of totality and so as to ensure it, that is to say, to confirm his address with distinction and support which is with separation in the essence of the oneness of totality, so as to realize and verify the singularities of the *ḥaqq* by virtue of His individuation in absoluteness and transcendence. So that in spite of Jesus' distinction and personal individuation, the totality of knowledge be relegated to and private to God in absoluteness and relativity and in oneness of totality and in separation, as nobody knows the Unknowable except God Himself. **And separated and collected into one, singularized and pluralized and expanded and contracted.** And Jesus (S.A.) separated the addresser from the addressee by the words: 'Praise to You', as well as uniting into one with the words: 'Had I said it You would certainly have known it.' That is to say, by virtue of the fact that God the High is Absolute and unindividuated in His own Ipseity, and by virtue of the fact that He is individuated in the image of Jesus, he united into one. Equally, by virtue of God's Uniqueness of Absolute Ipseity, through this uniting into one he unified it, and equally pluralized it with the words: 'You know what there is in my *nafs*, and I do not know what there is in Your *nafs*', and then he expanded it with his words: 'Indeed You, You are the Knower of the Unknown', because he relegated and privatized to God the knowledge which is by absoluteness and relativity, and then he also contracted it by banishing knowledge away from his own self and making it private to God. Under these considerations, the words: '. . . collected into one, singularized and pluralized, and expanded and contracted' happen to be for the declaration and distinction, but it is equally possible that these words are attributable to distinction which would mean that with the words:

'Indeed You, You . . .' he separates and pluralizes and unites into one, unifies and expands by relegating the knowledge as private to Him, and contracts the knowledge to Him alone by banishing it from anyone else. Then he said, as an ending to the answer: 'I did not tell them except with which You have ordered me', by denying first and indicating thereby that he was not himself. Then, he established the word within the prescription of good form with the questioner. If he had not done so he would have been qualified by the lack of knowledge of realities and he is far from such a thing. He said: '. . . nothing other than what You ordered me with, and You are the speaker over my tongue (in the oneness of totality (*jam'*) and closeness of obligation) and You are my tongue' (in discrimination and closeness of supererogatories), and look at this Divine spiritual awareness (awakening) (*tanbīh*), what made it so subtle and pleasant (*laḥff*) and what made it so fine (*raqīq*). After that, Jesus (S.A.), who is valid servant, answered in conclusion by saying: 'I did not tell my people except that which You ordered me to say.' By saying: 'I did not tell them . . .' he removed from himself the saying, though he was the indicator, which means that Jesus said these words when he was not in being, when he was annihilated in the Being of the *ḥaqq* and when he was in the relative non-existence. After that, Jesus (S.A.) established the saying due to complying with the necessary good form, because God had questioned him with the words: 'Did you say . . .?' It is due to his compliance with good form that he answered: 'I did not say . . .', and if Jesus (S.A.) had not answered in this way, surely he would have been qualified with the lack of knowledge of Reality, yet Jesus (S.A.) is higher than being qualified with the lack of knowledge of Reality. That is why he said: '. . . with no other than with which You ordered me.' Thus he answered with these words, meaning that I did not say that thing except with which You ordered me, when the one who spoke with my tongue was You, and this is the same as the station of oneness of totality and closeness of obligation, and when he added: 'You are my tongue', this is the same as the station of discrimination and supererogatories. Look then at this Divine spiritual awakening (awareness), with what thing He made it subtle and pleasant and with what thing He made it fine. He is the *laḥīf* and the *raqīq*. Making aware or awakening is activating, causing to act. That is to say, look at the subtlety and fineness of the information of Jesus who is the Spirit of God, how subtle and pleasant is his phraseology, and how fine is his pointing-out. In certain copies this is given as: 'Look at

this Divine spiritual awareness', which means that Jesus (S.A.), when he said: 'I did not except what You ordered me to say' (*amartani*), knowing that the *ḥaqq* was the same as himself that his words came from the very same oneness of totality, and singularized Him with the letter *ta* which alludes to the addressee, at the same time limiting his own self by virtue of his being under orders, differentiated it by the use of the letter *ya* which alludes to the one spoken to. Thus, with the *ta* of address he established Divinity of the *ḥaqq*, and with the letter *ya* of the addressee he established his own servanthood. And all this, by virtue of oneness of totality (*jam'*) and discrimination, all this happens in the words: '. . . nothing other than with which You ordered me.' It is not necessary for the word 'to make aware' (*tanbīh*) to be an erroneously inscribed form, and it is not necessary that from that should be taken the thought that it is a wisdom which is the wisdom of the doctrine of duality, bitheism, because in the words of Jesus dualizing is manifest. That is why the Shaykh qualified it with 'Divine spiritual'. 'That you pray to God (*Allāh*)', and he brought the Name *Allāh* due to the variety of the worshippers in worship and the variety of the religious laws, and did not particularize it to one proper Name, other than the Name, and used the Name which collects all, which means that I told them to pray to *Allāh* because You ordered me to say this. Thus Jesus (S.A.) in his words brought the Name *Allāh* due to the variety of worship among the worshippers, and due also to the variety of religious laws, and he avoided particularizing it to one Name rather than another Name of the proper Names, and used rather the Name *Allāh* which includes them all. That is to say, he used the word *Allāh* for that reason. because the Name *Allāh* includes the totality of the Divine Names and the totality of aspects of worship. He did not use a particular Name because the ways of the worshippers are varied and each one of them is invited to his private Lord. Thus it would not have been necessitated in wisdom to invite all the worshippers to one private Lord. After that he said: 'My Lord and your Lord', yet it is known that His relationship to one existent in Lordship is not the same relationship of another existent. He then particularized his people to the worship of his own Lord and to the Lord of his people, yet it is well known and certain that the relationship of the *ḥaqq* through Lordship to one existent is not the same as His relationship in Lordship to another existent, because God the High has dressed each existent with one of the private Names from among the Names which are at the degree of Divinity, thus each existent

is invited to worship his own private Lord. And in this way he distinguished with his words 'My Lord and your Lord' between the two allusions, the allusion to the one spoken to and the allusion to the addressee. (With the words) 'nothing other than with which You ordered me' he established himself as the one ordered, which is nothing other than his servanthood, as one does not give an order to someone from whom the agreement to the order is not imaginable, even if he cannot execute (the order). The relationship of God to an existent through Lordship being not the same as His relationship to another existent, Jesus (S.A.) distinguished with his words 'My Lord and your Lord' the two allusions, which are the allusion to the one spoken to and the allusion to the addressee, so that discriminating with the *ya* of the one spoken to referring to his own self, and the *kum* which refers to his people, he distinguished between the Lordship of a Name and its law to himself and the Lordship of a Name which determined over all his people. When he said: '. . . nothing other than with which You ordered me', he established his own self as one appointed to receive an order. However, the appointment of his own self as receiving an order is no other than his servanthood, because a person does not become appointed as receiving an order if that person were not imagined to concord with the order, even if he cannot concord. Thus Jesus (S.A.) established himself in servanthood. When the order came down according to the determinations of degrees, it dyes in this way all that manifest in a degree with what that degree's reality bestows; and the degree of being appointed as receiving an order, there is a determination which is apparent in all those who are appointed as receiver of an order. This is a special determination for each of those who are manifested in all the Divine degrees of immanence and individuation. That it is apparent in each appointee with an order is equal to all, whether it be the order of God and the appointee for the immanence, whether it be the order of immanence for the appointee of God, and whether it be the degree of order and Divine appointee for order, or immanential. Thus, for the degree of the appointee with an order there is a special determination which is apparent in each of the appointees, and that determination is responding to that order; if the order is God and the appointee is immanence, by concurring to His order and determination, and if the one who orders is the immanence and the appointee is the *ḥaqq*, by responding to its prayer and concurring and obeying it. Like in his answer to the question of his uncle, Abu Ṭâlib, who said: 'What did

your Lord bestow upon you, Oh Mohammed?”, he answered: ‘Oh uncle, He bestowed upon me obedience to you’; when the order is from the *ḥaqq* and the *khalq* is the one appointed to receive the order, it behoves the immanent to be dominated by and be concordant to that order when that immanential appointee manifests with the determination of that degree. When the order is from the immanent and the appointee to receive the order is God, like in the words: ‘Our Lord, cover up our transgressions’, it is not incumbent on the *ḥaqq* to concord with the order of the orderer. However, with the words: ‘Ask Me and I shall respond to you’ the *ḥaqq* has promised His concordance and made it incumbent upon Himself to concord, and the *ḥaqq* is faithful of promise and it is impossible that anything other than what He has promised could manifest, even though it is not necessary that what it has been promised for come to happen, because He promised going beyond what a thing was promised for: ‘And He goes beyond their transgressions.’ Equally, the degree of the giving of the order has a determination which is apparent in every order-giver. That determination is the proposal of the order to the one who receives the order, and the request that he should concord to the order proposed to him. Thus, when each orderer is dyed with the determination of an order and thus manifests, the orderer equally descends to that order by virtue of that order, and manifests. In the same way, when an appointee to receive an order is dyed with a determination of that order and manifests by virtue of that order, he descends to the appointee to receive the order and manifests therein. When God says: ‘Establish prayer’, that is the order, and the one to whom this order is proposed is the appointee to receive the order. And the servant says: ‘Lord forgive me’, and he is the one who gives the order and God is the appointee to receive the order. What the servant demands from God by his order is exactly the same as what God demands from the servant by His order. That which is requested from each side is concordance. Thus, if the Divine order descends to a degree from among the Divine degrees, in which degree God is the one who gives the order, and He manifests with the determination of that order, that order equally manifests by virtue of that degree whereby the immanents which are the givers of the order request concordance from God who is appointed to receive an order from the immanents, and the *ḥaqq* who is appointed to receive an order manifests by concordance to the determination of that order, but the *ḥaqq*, appointed to receive an order, does not concord to the giver of the order unwillingly, but He

is in accordance by what He has promised, willingly, and with Munificence and Generosity which He imposed over His *nafs*, because He imposed over His own Self Mercy and Compassion. And like this, all prayers are agreed to without a doubt, even if they are delayed, which means, because what God demanded of the servant is exactly the same as what the servant demanded of God, each prayer is answered, and it is impossible that it should not be answered, even though the coming about of the concordance with the prayer is delayed, because the degree of being appointed to receive an order necessitates concordance, but the concordance of God is a concordance of response and not a concordance of obligation like the concordance of the servant. Just as some of those to whom it is proposed that they establish an address by establishing a prayer, do not establish it at the time, and they delay their concordance and pray at another time when it is possible for them. With all this, it is without a doubt that he will concord and respond, even if only by intention. Thus, in this way, every prayer is equally responded to even if some of them are delayed in response by virtue of the fact that the state of the servant necessitates it, and the delay is better for the servant. God retards it only due to His Mercy and Compassion, and again He responds due to His Mercy and Compassion at another time. Thus the servant is under Compassion and Mercy at both times.

Now, the Shaykh (R.A.), during his verification of the words of Jesus: 'I did not except which You ordered me', expressed in this context the rule that by virtue of degrees the Divine order descended, with his words that: 'The order came down according to the determinations of degrees', which is due to his wishing to point out that when Jesus was appointed to receive an order with that which the degree of being ordered necessitated, that is to say, manifesting with concordance, it is exactly at the same time as the manifestation of that concordance and agreement to the order, as when the Divine order came to him. Thus, the one who orders descends by virtue of the place, and that place is completely receptive to that order in accordance with the necessities of that order. Thus, no word emanates from him other than that thing with which he has been ordered, because he is not qualified with anything other than the qualification of servanthood so that he could vary it from the image of the intention of the *haqq* when the orderer came down to him by virtue of the place and in accordance with the necessities of the special qualification and of the place. Thus Jesus (S.A.), when he says: 'I did not tell them other than what You have

ordered me to', means to say: I have no other qualification except my ipseity of servanthood, and there is no manifestation or existence in me other than Your Spirit. Therefore, whatever order emanates from You, words also emanate from me in the same manner. Then he said: 'And I was for them' and did not say 'over myself with them', like when he said 'My Lord and your Lord.' 'I was for them a witness while I continued among them.' By this saying, Jesus (S.A.) points out that while he continued among them he was witness over them, that is to say, he was the place of manifestation of the Name Witness, but in the matter of my being the place of manifestation, You were the witness and observer (*raqib*) over them, which means: Jesus (S.A.) did not say: 'I was witness over their selves by my self', that is to say, he did not establish witnessing for his own self when he established his witnessing over them, unlike where he said in his words: 'My Lord and your Lord', where he established a private Lord for his self and a private Lord for their self. In that the prophets are witnesses over their people while they continue among them, as they exist among their people with their elemental existence, because the prophets are the places of manifestation of the *haqq*, and the *haqq* is witness over the people with the revelation and manifestation of the Name Witness. That is why Jesus did not include himself in the witnessing of their *nafs*, and he did not say that he was witnessing himself like he witnessed them, because in the degree of witnessing, the loci of manifestation are in annihilation in the Essential Divine revelation. They have no being in that unless they also witness their own *nafs*. The prophets, from the aspect of their prophethood, are thereby witnesses over their people. That is to say, they are witnesses of their states and inclinations and of those things that their receptivity necessitates, so that they invite them to the *haqq* in accordance with vision, so that their names also find prolongation in the place of manifestation of the *haqq*, so that the *haqq* be cognized through them. The prophets are veiled from witnessing their own *nafs* which are established in accordance with non-existence at the level of their working for the education and bringing to discrimination and evolution of their people by being witness over their people. If, through the aspect of their saintliness, they turn to witnessing their own *nafs*, they would witness neither their *nafs*, nor any other thing than the Being of the *haqq* in the mirror of their own established potentialities, because their *nafs* is according to non-existence. What is witnessed would only be the revealed Being of the *haqq*. In that locus of witnessing,

all the manifested existences which are individualized according to their potentialities are witnessed in annihilation. There is no witnessing in there other than the witnessing of the One Being. Thus, He witnesses the people of Jesus from the place of manifestation of Jesus. The words: 'My Lord and their Lord' is at the level of the *nafs*, because the cognosis of the Lord is at the level of the *nafs* and there is no annihilation, and each person is the place of manifestation of a special Lord, and by virtue of the differentiations in the Lords it is necessary that there be in there differentiation and establishment and being. 'When You made me die', that is to say, when You lifted me up to Yourself and You veiled them from me, and veiled me from them, 'You were the Guardian (*raqib*) over them' in other than my materia (elemental materia), perhaps rather, in their materia. When You elevated me up to Yourself and veiled them from me by manifesting me in the level of spiritual image, they could not witness me because they only knew me in the image of my elemental presence. Equally, You veiled me from them because I cannot witness them at the level of Your witnessing. Then You become the guardian over them in materia other than my elemental materia. Perhaps even, in their materia, which means, under the consideration of You manifesting in their materia, You become their guardian. Thus these words are of the station of totality (*jam'*). You are their eyes, which necessitates the guardianship. The witnessing of Man of his own *nafs* is the witnessing of the *haqq* of it. This is to say that because in the closeness of supererogatories You became that eye of theirs which necessitates guardianship. Thus, Man's witnessing of his own *nafs* is God's witnessing of it, because he is guardian with God's vision. These words are from the station of difference. He brought it with the Name *raqib*, the Guardian, because he made it into witness to it. (In certain copies it is 'to himself'.) Jesus (S.A.) called God's witnessing which is in their materia with the Name Guardian, that is to say, in his speech he brought in the word Guardian, because Jesus (S.A.) made the witnessing for his own self when he said: 'And I was witness over them as long as I was among them.' Because he wished to differentiate between himself and his Lord so that it is known that he himself is a servant in his immanence, and that God, He is the Lord in his immanence, so he brought himself in that he was the witness and in so far as God, that He was the Guardian. Jesus (S.A.) wished to differentiate between himself and his Lord due to his respect of the proper form, so that he be not in association with the *haqq* in any one Name, so that it be known

definitely that Jesus is Jesus, because Jesus is servant singularized in servanthood. Also to let it be known definitely that the *ḥaqq* is the *ḥaqq*, because the *ḥaqq* for Jesus is Lord and Creator; so thus Jesus for his own *nafs* brought out the fact that he, Jesus, was the witness, and for God he brought out the fact that He was the guardian, and said: 'And You were the Guardian.' Qualifying himself with the word 'witness' and the *ḥaqq* with the word 'guardian' he differentiated between himself and his Lord. During his invitation of his people, being the witness he is veiled from witnessing his own reality and from witnessing the Reality of the *ḥaqq* manifested in him. When he was elevated from the sensory body and was under the witnessing of the *ḥaqq*, he became veiled from his people. That is why he said: '. . . witness while I was among them.' Thus, witnessing is not according to prevalence and circumscription, and the guardian does and necessitates the source and origin of guardianship, unless of course the designated, which is the temporary being, is appended to the relative. In the same way, when the witnessing is appended to the *ḥaqq*, which is of permanent being, it necessitates the continuity of witnessing. And he gave primacy, where it concerns his own *nafs*, to them (his people), and said: 'Over them witness while I continued among them', honouring them by putting them first, and through good form towards the *ḥaqq*. This means that by saying: 'Over them I was witness while I continued among them', Jesus gave priority to his people where it concerned his own self, that is to say, in the word 'them' at the beginning of the phrase, he gave priority to the pronoun in the sentence out of rendering honour to them by priority, and also due to his respect and through good form towards the *ḥaqq*, because in the words: 'You were You, the Guardian' he gave priority to the word '*ḥaqq*'. Thus, he gave priority to the pronoun 'them' over the Name 'witness' which is his own self, so that there be no equality in priority with the *ḥaqq*, and thus he respected the good form. This is so because the *ḥaqq* is witness over them in their own selves. Equally, giving priority also contains the meaning of giving the benefit of explanation to a particular, as one would say: 'You were over them specifically a witness without being so for others, but You, and You are the Guardian over them and over everything, and You are Witness over everything.' From the side of the *ḥaqq* he brought (the pronoun) 'them' later than the (word) '*ḥaqq*' in his words 'Guardian over them', as the *rabb* deserves priority by rank. Thus, by mentioning his people after the mention of the word 'guardian', he gave priority to the

haqq, because by the rank of Lordship the Lord deserves all priority. Then Jesus proclaimed that in fact for God, the Guardian, was the Name that he brought for himself, and that is 'the Witness' in his words 'Over them the witness', and he said: 'You are the Witness over everything.' Which means that Jesus (S.A.) proclaimed that in fact for God, the Guardian, that Name is established which Jesus mentioned for himself, and that Name is Witness, as in Jesus' words 'Over them witness.' Then Jesus said: 'You are the Witness over everything.' That is to say, having mentioned the Name Witness for himself, he then established the Name Guardian for God in his words: 'And You are Witness over everything.' What there is to understand where the Shaykh (R.A.) says: 'For God, the Guardian, the Name that Jesus brought for himself', is this, that the Name Witness is one of the subjects of the Name Guardian, when the Guardian descends to the station of the one named. He made (the word) 'all' for the generality, and by (the word) 'thing' completely denying any specific identity to anything in the immanence, and brought the Name Witness, for He is the Witness over all things witnessed by virtue of what reality necessitates in those witnessed. Jesus (S.A.) used the word 'all' which is for the generality. He also used the word 'thing' which is completely denying any specific identity to anything in the immanence. Also, he used the Name Witness. Thus God is Witness over all that is witnessed by virtue of what the reality of that which is witnessed necessitates. By the words: 'And You are the Witness over everything', Jesus (S.A.) differentiated between his being a witness and the *haqq* being a witness, because, as he said, he is witness over them only as long as he is present among them, whereas God is Witness by Essence and Knowledge from all eternity and forever over the images and all the states of everything manifest or interior, and according to the necessity of that thing's aptitude and its established potentiality. Perhaps Jesus (S.A.) referred his own witnessing also to the *haqq* during the time he was present among his people, when he said: 'And You are the Witness over everything', and that is why the Shaykh (R.A.) continues with: He made aware to that, that in fact He, the High, was the witness over the people of Jesus at the time he said: 'And I was witness over them while I continued among them', which means that Jesus (S.A.) meant to point out the fact that while he was present among his people, and saying that he was witness over them, that it was in fact the *haqq* who was witness over his people by the witnessing which was in his materia, and that it was God's witnessing in his own place of manifestation.

And this is the witnessing of the *ḥaqq* in the materia of Jesus, as it establishes that in fact He was his tongue, hearing and vision. This means that it is established in this information that in fact God is the tongue, the hearing and the vision of the servant. Then he pronounced the word of Jesus and of Mohammed. That it is of Jesus is because it is the words of Jesus by God's informing of it in His Book, and also, that it is Mohammedian is because of its happening from Mohammed (S.A.) in a specific place, where it happened from him and he stood up with it the whole night, repeating it without changing for any other thing until dawn, which means that Jesus (S.A.) spoke those words of Jesus which are also the words of Mohammed, but that these words are of Jesus is established by God's informing of them as Jesus' in His Book. On the other hand, that these words are Mohammedian is due to the fact that they happened to Mohammed (S.A.) in a certain place where they emanated from him, and that in that place Mohammed (S.A.) stood the whole night through, repeating those words without turning over to any other word until dawn, and those words were: 'If You punish them they are Your servants, and if You forgive it to them it is indeed that You are the Most Dear and the Most Wise.' These words are the words of Jesus because Jesus mentioned them concerning his people. They are also Mohammedian because they emanated from Mohammed (S.A.) a whole night through. 'Them' which is the pronoun for those not present, just as 'he' is the pronoun for the one not present, just as God said: 'Those who have covered up the Truth' with the pronoun for those unknown (people), covering them beyond all that is intended by those witnessed in the present. The pronoun 'them' is a pronoun which denotes those who are not immediately present, just as 'he' is a pronoun which denotes one who is not present, like in the words: 'Say: He, the God, is Unique', and other things like that. In fact God said: 'Those who have covered up the Truth' with the pronoun of unspecified unknown people. That is to say, He used the pronoun of the unknown in the phrase: 'They who have covered the Truth.' The people to which that pronoun is attributed He qualified with total covering. Thus, that lack of specification, that unknowable quantity to whom the pronoun 'they' or 'them' refers, became for those who cover up the Truth a covering away from that which is meant by those things witnessed in the present, because those who relegate the *ḥaqq* to the unknowable and demand from thence, become covered with absence from the *ḥaqq* who is present and manifest in the potentialities of beings with the Breath of *rahmân*

and revelation of *subhân*. And he said: 'If You punish them . . .' with the pronoun of the absent, and that is the very same thing as the veil from the *haqq* in which they are. Thus, when Jesus (S.A.) used the indefinite pronoun, meaning those who are absent, by saying: 'If You punish them . . .', that absence became the very same thing as the veil, that absence being the meaning of the pronoun of absence. The people who are intended by the pronoun 'them' became veiled from the *haqq* in that veil, and that veil is the veil of the individuation of Jesus, because they became veiled by the veil of the image of his (Jesus') individuation, because they had incarcerated the *haqq* in Jesus with their words: 'God, He is the Messiah, son of Mary.' And they covered the Truth, that is to say, they covered the *haqq* which was individuated in him. Consequently, they became absent from it, and that covering and that veil became for them the absence. It is also possible to consider this text as the words: 'If You punish them . . .' referring to the word 'punishment', then it would mean that if You punish them, their punishment would be their remaining in that veil. Thus, punishment becomes the same as that veil, in which veil they are veiled from the *haqq*. And God mentioned them, thus mentioned with the tongue of Jesus, or mentioned them with information of Jesus in the absence, with the words: 'If You punish them . . .' It is equally possible to understand in this that the pronoun for the subject, the actor, is hidden in the word 'and he mentioned', and this would refer to Jesus, which would mean that Jesus referred them to God. Prior to their presence before God, that is to say, before they reach the degree of presence with God, God mentioned that they are covered with the veil, and the fact that God mentioned them became the leaven for them. Even when they become present, which means that even when they reach the degree of presence with the *haqq*, or at the level of their coming into the presence of the *haqq* after their resurrection from the tomb on the Day of collecting and differentiating of the creatures, or equally, on the Great Day of Judgement, resurrecting from their bodies and corpses with which they were covered, which are the tombs of the creatures, if they happened to be in the presence of God by being annihilated (*fani*) in the *haqq*. The leaven would have determined over the dough and they would become like itself (the dough). What is meant by: 'The leaven would have determined over the dough' is that the leaven of God's mentioning them as absent would have determined in the dough of their aptitude and their reality in the degrees of being absent which

happens during their coming to the degree of presence with the *ḥaqq*. Thus the leaven would have made them like itself, and the veil of absentness which happened among them would be lifted and they would manifest with the Qualities of the *ḥaqq*, and thus, at the level of presence they would equally be mentioning forgiving and forgiveness. 'Because they are indeed Your servants', and he singularized the address to *tawḥīd* upon which they were. This is to be understood that when Jesus (S.A.) said: 'They are Your servants', he meant to say: 'Because they are Your servants, whatever thing they worship they will worship You.' Thus he singularized the address with his words with the letter *kaf* due to that *tawḥīd* according to which they were established, in consideration of the oneness of Essence, because God the High is manifest and revealed by a Name in the place of manifestation of the one worshipped by the worshipper. Consequently, the worship of all the worshippers refers to the One Essence which is the collectivity of all the Names, even though some of the worshippers have no knowledge of this. God says: 'And it is ordained by your Lord that thou wilt not worship any other.' And there is no greater submissiveness than the submissiveness in which they (the servants) were, because they have no personal dispensing ability in their selves. They are determined by what their Lord wills, and there is no association for them in that. Because of that he (Jesus) said 'Your servants', and singularized (the God). This is a case where Jesus either through the tongue of God, or the *ḥaqq* through the tongue of Jesus, said of His servants, or said 'Your servants', thus he singularized the one worshipped. What is meant by punishment is the subjugation, and there is none more submissive than them because of their being the servants, and their persons necessitates that they are the most submissive, and: 'You will not make them more abject, because You will not make them more abject than what they are already in, from their being the servant.' That is to say, their essences and the servanthood necessitates that they are submissive, and You would not make them more abject with lower submissiveness than that submissiveness in which they already are, being servants. In other words, You will not make them more submissive than the submissiveness of servanthood. Consequently, You will not punish them with lower punishment. And if You overlook their shortcomings (forgive them) it is as if You covered them from the affliction of torment which they deserved by their opposition, as though overlooking their shortcomings covers them (protects them) from that and prevents them (from being afflicted), because You, You are the

Precious ('*azîz*). That is to say, even if they deserve torment due to their opposition, if You overlook it, which will cover them from the affliction of torment and prevent affliction reaching them, then indeed You are the Precious, so to speak, the Preventer and the Protector, which means, since You are the Protector, whatever afflicts other than the Names of destruction, You prevent that affliction from reaching them by the Preciousness of the Singularity of Your Ipseity. Thus the Preventer has the meaning of actor, and the Protector is the object that is that which is protected. However, it could also be the Name of the subject, the Protector. Thus, when the word 'Protector' is related to the Ipseity of the *ḥaqq*, then the Ipseity of Uniqueness becomes the Protector, and the *ḥaqq* with His Essential Preciousness increases the side of the protectivity of the Uniqueness, and becomes Preventer from otherness and cuts with the sword of preciousness the rivalry of the others. In the first case they are the objects of protection for the *ḥaqq* who, with the Light of Ipseity, overlooked their shortcomings and covered them with the quality of overlooking shortcomings from the dominion of the Names which are in complementary opposition to the Name *ghafûr* (the Overlooker of shortcomings). The reaching to You of this people is not by virtue of the fact that You are the total Lord according to what is necessitated in Yourself by Your Ipseity, because Your Lordship is by virtue of their selves and their servanthood, and their servanthood is relative and partial since they are relative and partial. How could they then worship You with the total essential worship which You deserve by Your Ipseity, and how could they then reach You by virtue of Your being the total Lord? And this Name, when God bestows it to one of His servants, then God is named by that which is known, and this Name '*azîz* is for the one to whom it is bestowed, and It becomes Preventer and Protector and wills it far away from the Avenger and the Tormenter, from revenge and torment. When God bestows this Name '*azîz* to one of His servants, that is to say, if He revealed Himself to him with the Name '*azîz*, that person also becomes qualified by and realized in the Name Precious. Then God the High is called *mu'izz* (one of the 99 Names—the Endearer, the Precious-maker) because He has made His servant precious, and the servant to whom this Name has been bestowed is called '*azîz*, the Precious, because where God is concerned he has become precious. Thus God becomes Preventer and Protector from the Name Tormenter and Avenger with will to inflict of vengeance and torment. Consequently, the servant who

is named with the Name Precious becomes protector for the *ḥaqq* because the protector is precious. Also, the *ḥaqq* is Protector and Preventer from the attack and dominion of others. He brought by supporting and detailing, as well as corroboration in the pronouncement, so that the act (*âyat*) happens according to one impulsion, because of the words: 'You, You are the Knower of the Unknown', and in the words: 'You, You were the Guardian (*raqîb*) over them', and again in the same way: 'In that You, You are the Precious ('*azîz*) and the Wise (*ḥakîm*).' Thus Jesus (S.A.) brought the words with detail and support like he did before, to corroborate the pronouncement and also so that the act (*âyat*) happens according to one impulsion. He brought in this case the words: 'In that You, You are the '*azîz* and *ḥakîm*' in the same way as he had done before where he said: 'In that You, You are the Knower of the Unknowable', and in the sentence: 'You, You were the Guardian over them.' The Shaykh (R.A.), after proclaiming some of the mysteries which the mystery of Jesus (S.A.) comprises, proceeds with proclaiming some of the states appertaining to Mohammed (S.A.), which are equally comprised. There was a question asked of the Prophet of the importunity to his Lord in this matter of the total night until dawn of repeating his request to have an answer. If he had heard the answer at the beginning, he would not have repeated. Thus this word is a question from the Prophet (S.A.) and it was also an importunity, in this matter of the totality of the night until dawn, to his Lord. That is to say, during the whole of the night to dawn he repeated and returned this, because he requested agreement to his question. Thus, if he had heard the agreement to his question at the beginning he would not have repeated it. It was that the *ḥaqq* represented to him the details of what they demanded of torment, in detailed representation, and he said to Him in each representation and for each potentiality: 'If You punish them, indeed they are Your servants, and if You were to overlook their shortcomings, indeed You are You, the '*azîz* and *ḥakîm*', and if he had seen in this representation that which necessitated (giving) first consideration to God and the gift of His Person, he would have prayed over them, not for them, but He did not represent to him except that which they deserved in that which this verset bestows of abandoning oneself to God and to committing to His forgiveness. In this, the word '*kâna*' can be interpreted in many ways: it can be 'and it was that', or it can be referring to God's detailed representing of the matter, that is to say, the way God represented it, or it can be to mean with more strength to mean 'in that'. According

to the first possibility, which is the most likely, it would mean that God used to represent it with detailed representation to the Envoy (S.A.), that shortcoming, due to which shortcoming his people required punishment. That is to say, He used to represent in detail and singularly the shortcoming of each one of the people from among the members of His servants. Thus, the Envoy (S.A.) would repeat to God the phrase: 'If You punish them, indeed they are Your servants, and if You were to overlook their shortcomings, indeed You are You, the *'aziz* and *hakim*' in each representation and for each potentiality. Thus, had the Envoy (S.A.) witnessed in that detailed representation that which caused the necessity of giving first consideration to God and that which caused His Person's gifts, surely the Envoy (S.A.) would have prayed over them, not for them, and would have given priority to God's intention over his own intention, because he would have seen that God the High wanted to vanquish them and take revenge, whereas the Envoy (S.A.) pleaded for forgiveness and overlooking of their shortcomings. God the High, prior to that night and His detailed representation, had not detailed their crime and their shortcomings except that thing by which they deserved what this *ayat* of God the High bestowed of abandoning oneself to God and to committing to His forgiveness. That is to say, He represented that which was necessitating the expanding of their shortcomings to forgiveness, as well as that his people were abandoned to Him and that the people were His servants, through what the Envoy (S.A.) said in his prayer, and it was for this purpose that these words emanated from the Envoy (S.A.). And if it were that God the High had represented to him in detail only the potentiality of their shortcomings and His will to avenge Himself over them, then the Envoy would not have prayed for them. He would have prayed over them. And what God the High meant by what He represented to the Envoy (S.A.) is their shortcomings, because shortcoming demands overlooking the shortcoming. In the words: '. . . that which they deserved' there is the meaning of that very thing, and in the words 'that which . . . bestows', 'that which' means 'in this way', and the letter *ya* means 'which is' and is the subject of the words 'that which they deserved'. It could also be that the object of 'that which they deserved' is eliminated by what the meaning of the words 'committing to His forgiveness' points out, where then the word 'bestows' is interchangeable with the words 'they deserved', as if to say: that which God represented to him of their shortcomings in detail is no other than that which this *ayat*

bestows of abandoning and committing to His forgiveness. And it came that indeed God, when He likes the voice of His servant in the prayer, He sometimes delays responding to it so that he repeats it, and this is due to His love in this, not because He turns away from him, and it is because of this that He brought it with the Name the Wise, and the wise is he who places the things in their proper place and does not change in them what their reality and their quality necessitates and requires. And it arrived in the information (*ḥadīth*) that in fact God the High, when He loved the voice of His servant in his prayer to Him, He retards agreement to his prayer so that the prayer is repeated from him. Thus, retarding is due to the love of the servant and not because He had turned away from him. It is because of this that in the words: 'You, You are the *'azīz* and *ḥakīm*' God brought (relating what Jesus said) the Name Wise. The wise is such a person who places things in their proper places and who does not swerve from what the realities and qualities of things necessitate and require. In other words, he does not swerve from placing everything in accordance with what its reality and quality necessitates. Thus, if retarding the answer is more beneficial to the servant, God retards the answer as His Wisdom necessitates. The intercession and the prayer of the Envoy (S.A.) all through the night which concerned his people, was retarded until dawn due to love, and due to His love of his voice concerning his people. The wise is he who knows the proper order. And the S.A. in his repetition of this verset was according to a grand knowledge, and he who reads this verset, or others, let him read like this, otherwise silence is better. This means that the Envoy (S.A.), in the repetition of this verset, was in accordance with a grand knowledge from God the High. That is to say, as he repeated it, Divine knowledges and meanings of the Unknowable were revealed to him. He used to address God in the reading of the verset and God answered him, and God would address him and he would answer. Thus, if somebody wanted to read this verset or versets other than this, let him read it like the Envoy (S.A.) did, or else silence is better for him. What is meant by this is, with the ease and tranquillity of the heart, reflection in the meanings of the versets and being meditative, to incite and to endeavour to its realization with all its reality. And if God finds it more appropriate for His servant to speak by His order, He does not find this appropriate for him except that He has already willed responding to it in this and decreed his affair. When God the High finds it appropriate for a servant, in an order from among the orders, to come to speech,

He did not find it appropriate for that servant in that speech except that in fact He willed the responding to that speech and the decreeing of the execution of that matter. It is possible in this sentence that the word 'ilâ' could mean "*alayya*", in which case the sentence above would read: He did not find it appropriate for him in that He had already agreed for him in this . . . etc. And God the High says: 'Brought down to you, and brought down for you.' Not a person should deem that what is appropriate to it is not comprised in it. Thus, not one person should deem a thing to be that that which is appropriate to it does not comprise it, that is to say that a person who has been found appropriate for a prayer should deem the response is slow, because the prayer comprises response. Thus the person who is appropriate for the prayer is also appropriate for the response even if the prayer happens to be retarded. The word 'comprised in it' refers always to the prayer. And let him persevere with the perseverance of the Envoy (S.A.), as in this verset, with all his states, until he hears with his ear or with his hearing (of the heart), whichever way you wish to (hear), or whichever way God makes you hear His response, because it is your desert, either to the request by the tongue which He makes you hear by your ear, or it is your desert, that which He makes you hear by meaning by your hearing. Let him persevere in all his states in prayer, just as the Prophet (S.A.) persevered in this verset, until he hears by his ear which is the tool of hearing of the body, or let him hear by hearing which is the tool of hearing of the heart, because hearing is spiritual. Respecting the indefiniteness of this address, he (the Shaykh R.A.) said: '. . . whichever way you wish', that is to say, by whichever tongue you ask, you will hear by that hearing, or it means by whichever way God the High makes you hear the response. Thus, if He will give you your desert by the tongue of the question, He will make you hear His response by the ear, and if He is going to give you your desert through the question of meaning, He will make you hear His response with the hearing of the heart, because giving the desert is by virtue of the question. And *hamd* to God, the Lord of the Universes.

